

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, D.D.

VOLUME XXIV.

JANUARY—JUNE, 1932

FILE COPY.
NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY.

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY
A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SEWYAN, D.D.

VOLUME XXIV.
JANUARY-JUNE, 1932

FILE COPY
JUN 28 1932

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
LONDON

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIV

JANUARY, 1932

No. 139

EDITORIAL

THE Note on the practice of Economy in the Orthodox Church, which we publish below, is a timely contribution to the discussions which are to take place in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury this month. These discussions arise out of Resolutions passed by the Upper House last year, and these in turn arose out of Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930. In our comments upon the Lambeth Conference at the time we observed that Resolution 42 seemed open to serious objections, though these seemed to be to some extent limited by the fact that the Resolution fell under the general heading "Special Areas." But the objections become much more formidable when the Province of Canterbury is reckoned as a "Special Area"; for in that case the limitation implied in the heading appears to be without meaning.

The discovery of new manuscripts of large parts of the Greek Bible, including some which are older than anything we have yet possessed, is an event of great significance, both in itself and for the hope it arouses that other finds may still be expected. We understand that some time must elapse before Sir Frederic Kenyon's collection of the MSS. will be available for publication. But meanwhile it is gratifying to know that the new discovery tends to verify the conclusions to which the textual criticism of the last decade and more has been tending, not least as to the importance of the Koridethi MS. and its cognates.

The death of Canon Lacey, who was a frequent contributor to THEOLOGY, removes from our midst one whose gifts the Church of England can ill spare. An accomplished Augustinian scholar, a learned canonist, an incisive yet always courteous controversialist, he had a rare gift of getting at the real point of a problem and of illuminating it. In regard to questions of Church and State, especially as these affected the marriage laws, he was a most able authority; while his "ecclesiastical sense," coupled with his personal friendship with continental Catholic divines, gave him great insight into the Reunion problem. R.I.P.

THE DISARMAMENT PASSAGE IN ISAIAH II. AND MICAH IV.

THERE are few phenomena in O.T. literature more difficult to explain than the double appearance of the same passage in Is. ii. 2-4 and Mic. iv. 1-4. It is true that these places give different recensions of the text and that the version in Micah has a verse more than that in Isaiah, but there can be no doubt that the original of both is the same. It is also to be noticed that in each case the passage follows immediately upon severe denunciations of the sins of Judah and predictions of terrible judgments. The two writers who introduce it in this way were contemporaries, and each of them seems to regard it as a ray of light for the future which may illumine the dark horrors of the situation they depict and of the impending judgment they announce.

It is not surprising that the explanations of this phenomenon have been various, and that even now there is no general agreement on the subject. The older interpreters regarded this passage as a quotation by both prophets of an earlier written oracle of an unnamed prophet (Delitzsch, Ewald, Cheyne in 1887). Others assign the authorship to Isaiah (Duhm, Sellin) or to Micah (Orelli). Others, again, are of opinion that we have here an interpolation of a later date in both prophets (Nowack, Budde, Marti, Peake's Commentary). The mere enumeration of these views is enough to emphasize the difficulties inherent in the subject. Before entering upon the examination of them it will be well to examine the passage itself and try to find out what it really predicts or hopes for.

First there is the somewhat difficult task of obtaining the original text from the four recensions—viz., two Hebrew and two Greek. Neither Hebrew text can claim a marked superiority over the other. In ver. 2 Is.=1 Mic. the text of Micah seems more primitive. but in ver. 4 Is.=3 Mic. the contrary is the case. A similar state of things is to be found in the parallel case of Obad. 1.-9 and Jer. xlix. The following is offered as the probable original text:*

* Is. v. 2, Mic. v. 1, *N'hayah*. In LXX of Is. (not so in Mic.) this is rendered *ὅτι τότε* = *Ki yihyeh*. This is the *Ki* of quotation introducing the *oratio directa* (Ruth i. 10; 1 Sam. x. 19, etc. Driver, Sam. i, p. 22; Ges.-K. 157b). We think this reading should be adopted.

B'acherith ha-yamim. This phrase does not seem to mean here the end of all things, the final stage, or any idea of that order, but merely denotes some future time not more exactly defined (Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30, xxxi. 29; Jer. xxiii. 20; see Job viii. 7).

Nakon. The LXX in Is. translate *ἐμφανές*. They have in Mic. what seems to be a conflation of alternative readings *ἐμφανές* *ἐτοιμον* (which latter word is used

"It will come to pass in after days
That Jahweh's mountain will be fixed
And the house of God, above all mountains,
And will be lifted up above all hills,
And nations will stream to it.
And many peoples will go and say,
Come! and let us go up to Jahweh's mountain
To the house of the God of Jacob,
That He may teach us out of His ways,
And we will walk in His paths.
For out of Sion will go forth instruction
And a word of Jahweh from Jerusalem.
And He shall judge between the nations,
And decide between many peoples.
And they shall beat their swords to plough-shares
And their lances into pruning-knives.
Nation will not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.
And every man shall sit under his vine
And under his fig tree with none to make him tremble."

"For the mouth of Jahweh Sebaoth has said it."

The verse Mic. iv. 4, the end of the poem, is not found in Is. As Sellin observed, Micah was a country man, and this thought appealed more to him than to Isaiah, the city man.

It does not appear likely that there is any reference in this oracle to the Babylonian myth* of the Mountain of Assembly in the extreme north, the meeting place of the gods (Is. xiv. 13; Ezek. xxviii. 14). This poem is in praise of Jahweh's mountain Sion and its temple, and Hebrew poets required no higher summits to call forth their hymns of praise. Mount Sion was beautiful for elevation, a joy of the whole land (Ps. xlviii. 3), and the highest peaks in Palestine looked with envy on the mountain where God delighted to dwell (Ps. lxviii. 16). The

for *nakon* in LXX of Ex. xxxiv. 2). Latin in both places *præparatus*. These renderings do not appear to throw any doubt on the text.

Naharu. In Mic. LXX have *σπένδουσι* = *Maharu* or *Miharu* (2 Chron. xxiv. 5). In Mic. v. 4 Lat. has *properabunt* for *Halachu*. This is rather attractive, as the same thought occurs Ps. lxviii. 31 (amended, see Cannon, 68th Psalm, p. 53). But in Is. the LXX do not support this, and the sense of "stream" is assured by Jer. xxxi. 11.

Beth-Yahweh. In both versions LXX omit *Beth*, adding in Is. *καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ*. This distinguishes between the mountain and the temple and agrees with v. 3; omit *Beth* and add (after *Yahweh*) *Oo beth elohim* (Nowack-Marti).

Kol-Haggoyim. Is. LXX πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. In Mic. 'Amim, LXX λαοί. The more modest expectation in Mic. seems more original and is to be preferred.

Is. v. 4, Mic. v. 3 is longer in Mic.

Is.
The nations
Many peoples

Mic.
Mighty peoples
Powerful nations from afar

The simpler version in Isaiah (adopted by Duhm) seems more original. The words in Micah 'ad rāchog look like a later gloss (Sellin).

* See G. A. Cooke, *Old Testament Essays*, 1929, p. 40.

Babylonian myth seems only to be used by Hebrew writers in connection with heathen kings.*

Nor does it appear necessary for the interpretation of the text to suppose that it means that Sion the temple-mountain would by some miracle be elevated in physical external reality so as to be higher than all the mountains in the world. The only passage which could support this view is Ezek. xl. 2, where the prophet calls this hill "a very high mountain." It will, however, be remembered that he was describing a *vision*, that he had not seen Sion for twenty-five years, and that it seemed to him "very high" in comparison not with other mountains, but with the level plains in which he was living.

Rather, the sense of our passage is that Sion with its temple is to be at the head (*B'rosh* as in 1 Kings xxi. 9; Am. vi. 7; Jer. xxxi. 6) of all mountains in fame and reputation, and lifted up (*Nasa* as Ps. xciv. 2; Is. lii. 13) in moral dignity and estimation. It is not on account of its physical height or grandeur, but of its moral elevation that peoples will resort there; it will be extolled as the place where wise counsels and words of Divine wisdom may be obtained. So exalted will be its repute that national disputes will be adjudicated upon and decided there, and wars will be no longer required to settle them.

Nor is there in this passage any prediction of the conversion of the nations to the religion of Judah such as is found in Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Zechariah and other places. There is no indication that the peoples referred to will come to Sion as proselytes or for worship or sacrifice. They are rather thought of as coming to learn ethical wisdom from so celebrated a source, and to obtain a just and equitable decision of their disputes. As Duhm observes, in early times men took a very detached view in matters of religion, and were by no means adherents of the god whose special help they sought (2 Kings i. 2 f.). It was the Divine wisdom and the pure justice known to be found in Sion which would attract these foreign embassies there.

Then, again, it cannot be supposed (whoever wrote this passage) that the author intended to predict that all great world powers like the Assyrians or Egyptians would be likely to send embassies to Sion to seek a peaceable solution of their differences. The "peoples" and "nations" here thought of as coming on such errands seem rather to be the smaller nations surrounding Judah, such as Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, Arabs and others who were constantly at war with Israel or Judah or each other, and by their vicinity to Judah or by

* The words *Yarkete Hassaphon*, "the recesses of the North," Ps. xlviii. 3, have been considered to contain an allusion to this myth. But these words have no meaning in relation to Sion and are probably a marginal gloss from Is. xiv. 13.

similarity of language were most likely to be acquainted with the religious and ethical superiority of Sion in the "after days" to which the oracle looks forward. In those happy days of Sion's moral elevation these peoples, wearied with perpetual warfare, would send embassies to Sion, as the Greeks and others did to the ancient oracles, and receive oracular responses of Divine wisdom which would resolve their disputes, wars would cease, and the people of Judah would be able to live in a state of quiet prosperity as in the happy and peaceful time of Solomon (1 Kings v. 5).

In both Isaiah and Micah this passage is so foreign to its context that it must be either a quotation by both or an interpolation by a later hand in both. There are strong reasons for thinking that it is the former. Not only is it introduced by a formula of quotation (crit. note above), but it is closed by such a formula, "For the mouth of Jahweh Sebaoth has said it." There are elsewhere analogies for such formulæ at the end of quotations. Is. xv.-xvi. 12 is a quotation from an earlier oracle, and in xvi. 13 Isaiah notes, "This is the word which Jahweh spoke about Moab some time ago." Similarly in Joel iii. 5 there is a quotation from Obad. xvii. followed by the words "according as Jahweh has said."

The quotations from this earlier source in Isaiah and Micah vary in a way which seems to suggest that both prophets, while quoting from a well-known and written original, either quoted from memory or from varying copies. In both cases the words of an older prophet seem to have had a message of consolation and relief to these men as they mournfully described the sins and calamities of their own days.

Assuming, then, that this was in both cases a quotation from an earlier source, it must date back to the earliest days of written prophecy. If any of the early prophets, such as Ahijah of Shiloh (1 Kings. xi. 29), Elijah, Elisha, Micaiah ben Imlah, left any written oracles they are lost to us. And yet we know that there was written prophecy before Amos. The passage Is. xv.-xvi. 12 may well be the oldest extant specimen of written prophecy. It dates from the reign of Azariah-Uzziah, and we see reasons for thinking that our doubly-quoted oracle is of the same period.

The reign of this king was a brilliant one. He was the supreme lord of the small nations which surrounded Judah; the Edomite ports on the Gulf of Akaba were recovered by him. He waged successful wars with Philistines, Arabians and the people of Main (S.E. of Petra). The coast land was secured, and tribute received from Ammon; his reputation extended as far as Egypt. Much is told of his military plans, his for-

tifications, and his strengthening of the defences of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxvi.).* To Moab, then sorely oppressed, Azariah-Uzziah offers protection on payment of tribute, and we have this very remarkable description of the Judæan king: "A throne is established in righteousness, and one sits thereon in faithfulness in the tent of David judging and seeking justice and prompt in righteousness" (Is. xvi. 1-5).†

We suggest that it was at this period when Azariah-Uzziah was the paramount lord of the peoples who surrounded him and had obtained a special reputation for just and prompt judgment and was in harmony with the pious Zachariah (2 Chron. xxvi. 5)‡ that some gifted prophet in Judah uttered this oracle. He describes how in future days the peoples around would flow to Sion to obtain from the successors of the wise king and the holy prophet a decision of their differences. It must be remembered that at this period the power of Assyria in the west was for a time in abeyance;§ a strong king, Jeroboam II., held back the Syrians, and the tranquil hegemony of Judah seemed likely to continue. So we have as a basis of these high hopes the wise king, lord of the nations around, the religious teacher to pronounce righteous *toroth*, and a state of peace and comfort which reminded men of the days of Solomon.

The preservation of this prophecy in a written form and its twofold quotation suggest that it had attracted much attention, and as the times grew less cheerful and the Assyrian menace drew nearer, it seemed a ray of light in a gloomy present. Both Isaiah and Micah began their prophetic career after the glories of Azariah-Uzziah had passed away (Is. vi. 1; Mic. i. 1). It is a curious circumstance that both used the old oracle in the same way, for the difference in the texts seems to negative the possibility that either of them copied from the other.

The hypothesis of interpolation in the fifth century is very difficult to combine with the facts.

(a) If it were to prevail we should have to believe that in that century (Marti) it occurred to some one to insert in one of the oldest parts of Isaiah's oracles (chaps. ii.-iv.) a poem of consolation—whether an old or a new poem does not appear. This would not be very easy, as the little book would by this time be well known. Still it is possible. But we are then expected to assume that the same person thought fit to insert in the roll of Micah, in

* *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, III., 378. We do not propose to discuss here the difficult question of the supposed identity of this king with Az-ri-ya-iu of Ya-udi. *Ibid.* 36. Burney, *Kings* 321.

† See Cannon, "Israel and Moab," *THEOLOGY*, May, 1930, p. 257.

‡ The M.T. in this v. is not satisfactory. After *Hammebin* LXX have ἐν φόνῳ κυρίου. Syr. to the same effect, which we adopt.

§ *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, III., 29, 176.

a place which was well known in the days of Jeremiah (xxvi. 18), and must have been even better known ever since, a different recension of the same poem with important variations and an additional verse, and that in both cases he succeeded in getting his insertion accepted as part of the text. The writer does not find himself able to believe that this series of events ever took place. And it is even more difficult to believe that two independent interpolators in the same period used the same poem in just the same way.

(b) The aspirations of this poem are quite unsuited to the political status of the Jews in the Persian period. They and the small nations around them were under the control of Persian satraps, and a stream of embassies to obtain instruction and judgment in their disputes would have appeared a most unlikely event, and one which the Persian authorities would never have allowed. The Jews had only been able to rebuild their temple and walls by the permission of their foreign masters. "With the last measures of Nehemiah the last appearance of civic independence had also completely disappeared. Jerusalem became a Persian citadel, the country not much more than the country of an old city-state entirely without political rights."* Could anyone hope that any decision given in Sion would end wars, when Persian armies were constantly marching through Judea to the Egyptian wars, or when the immense armaments of Xerxes against Greece comprised Phœnicians and other peoples from Palestine?† This was no period for predictions of general disarmament. It was not the period when such aspirations could be uttered or felt. No one, however enthusiastic, could dream that the Persians or any other great world power would seek instruction from Sion or a word of Jahweh from Jerusalem, and leave off making war as a result of it.

(c) If this oracle dates from the fifth century it is not possible to understand why it contains no reference to the then current eschatology which had been gradually developed since Zephaniah by Jeremiah, Ezekiel and other prophets, and finally stereotyped by Joel‡ (cir. 450). There is no trace here of the day of Jahweh with its dread portents in heaven and on earth, nothing of the assembly of all nations in the Valley of Decision nor of their final destruction. It is an entirely different conception, and does not contain a single trait taken from this dominant conception in Jewish thought. Joel, in fact (iv. 9, 10), alludes to and reverses this old oracle of peace, and proclaims a Holy War. If our oracle had appeared at this epoch it could

* Kittel, *Gesch.*, III., 651.

† Herod. vii. 89.

‡ The relevant quotations are brought together in Cannon. The day of the Lord in Joel, *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1926.

not have been so utterly detached from the eschatological thought which, as Malachi and Joel show, was at that day the ruling idea in Judaism.* Its outlook and aspirations are utterly different: the nations are not to be assembled and annihilated, but to live at peace with one another.

Finally there is the hypothesis that this poem was composed by Isaiah in his extreme old age, not for the general public, but for his pupils and adherents along with chaps. xi. and xxxii., not as a prophet but as a poet—as a kind of swan-song (Duhm). This, in view of Is. viii. 16, is quite possible. But how on this view did a different version of this poem come to be inserted in Micah? We do not know whether Micah was still living when the aged Isaiah is supposed to have composed this poem, nor could he have quoted it from his great contemporary (Sellin) until it was made public and not merely treasured up by a few friends of the old man. But, as has been already pointed out, the different text and the added verse show clearly enough that Micah quoted the poem from some other source than Isaiah. We do not, indeed, agree with those critics who think that it would have been considered *theft* for one prophet to quote from another (Jer. xxiii. 30). Jeremiah himself quoted from Micah (xxvi. 18). It is the literary phenomena which demonstrate that in this instance Micah did not quote from Isaiah.

The whole question is anything but easy of solution, but, for the reasons which we have endeavoured to express above, the hypothesis of an older oracle as the basis of both quotations seems to offer less difficulties than any other that can be suggested.

It is very interesting to find at so early a date the conception that war is not the only way of settling disputes between nations, and that a wise and upright mediation might render them unnecessary. We seem to discern in this ancient oracle an adumbration of the order of ideas which has taken form in our days in the League of Nations and proposals for general disarmament.

W. W. CANNON.

THE USE AND ABUSE OF PAPIAS ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE main purpose of this note is to suggest that there is extant a fragment of Papias sometimes overlooked in discussion of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, whose effect is to put *hors*

* Der Glaube an die Nähe dieses Tages die Gemüther des Volkes erfüllt hat, er stand offenbar im Mittelpunkt der religiösen Gedankenwelt.—Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 3, p. 88.

concours that modern favourite for authorship, the elusive "Elder" John. It may also suggest that there is some limit to the evidence to be drawn from Papias. Two generations of scholars have felt their theories of gospel origins incomplete until they had perverted the pliable Greek of these fragments. Two generations of theological students have been compelled to encounter these dubious scraps more frequently than any other sentences of the whole patrology. It is improbable that what follows will do anything to end the annoyance.

Papias, in the fragment of his Preface quoted by Eusebius, mentions Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί, "Aristion and John the Elder, disciples of the Lord," as sources of tradition along with certain Apostles, among them John, presumably the son of Zebedee. The "Elder" John who thus casually appears in history has had a brilliant posthumous career of authorship. He was credited by Eusebius, with some hesitation, with the Apocalypse, and by St. Jerome and Pope St. Damasus with the Epistles we call II. and III. John. Now he is put forward as the author of the Fourth Gospel. As long ago as 1889 his candidature for this honour was initiated by Delff, and scholars such as Burney, Swete and R. H. Charles have often dallied with him since. But his most complete biographer to date is Dr. Streeter, in *The Four Gospels** and its pendant *The Primitive Church*.† We may therefore briefly state the case as set forward by that most plausible and attractive advocate.

In Papias' enigmatic ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ κυρίου μαθητ(ῆς) is contained, according to Canon Streeter, the following biography: An actual eye-witness of the Crucifixion was a Jewish boy of twelve or thereabouts, taken by his father to Jerusalem for that year's Passover. This boy subsequently became for a brief time a disciple of John the son of Zebedee in Galilee. "One of his temperament might easily come to conceive a mystical veneration for the aged apostle who had leaned on the Lord's breast at the last supper."‡ "A brief and, as it seemed in the halo of later recollection, a wonderful connection with the Apostle—perhaps also a few never-to-be-forgotten words of Christ derived from his lips—would make the attitude towards the Beloved Disciple expressed in the Gospel psychologically explicable."§

Long years afterwards this gifted boy was to become, in the

* Macmillan, 1924, cited as *F.G.*

† Macmillan, 1929, cited as *P.C.*

‡ *F.G.*, p. 433. Incidentally, why "aged apostle" at this stage? This would seem to be a "composite photograph" between the tradition and his own Revised Version of the kind Dr. Streeter gently deprecates in connection with modern apologetic for the Resurrection narratives only two chapters before (*ibid.*, pp. 384 sq.).

§ *F.G.*, p. 433.

dark days of Domitian, Bishop of Ephesus and almost Primate of Asia. There, curiously enough, his following consisted principally of "bright young progressives" and "some of the younger presbyters . . . spending half their days in hair-splitting discussion." "To some of them he was already become something of the old fogey now, but to most he was still the great leader, the founder of a truly scientific theology."* Naturally, the latter opinion triumphed in the end: "Along with, indeed in front of, Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna, Ignatius of Antioch, we must place the Elder John" as one of the "outstanding leaders in the great Churches."†

All this from three words of Papias may seem to savour more of the methods of Sexton Blake than Lightfoot. Even so, the edifice is less secure than it would seem. The all-important words τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί are missing both from the Syriac version of Eusebius and from the Rufinian Latin translation, both made within a century of the publication of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.‡ Scholars so various as Mommsen,§ Père Lagrange|| and Dr. Moffatt,¶ who are all entitled to an opinion, have held them an interpolation in the Greek. Without going so far as that, it is possible to find it easier to see how they might come to be inserted in the Greek than why they were omitted from the Syriac. Before building quite so much upon them, it would have been well to demonstrate their authenticity, or at least to warn us that competent scholars have had their doubts. This question is passed over by Dr. Streeter in the completest silence. But since the only statement the words profess to contain—viz., that John the Elder was an actual "*disciple* of the Lord"—is quite irreconcilable with Canon Streeter's deductions from them, perhaps the omission does not greatly matter.

But this new *legenda* goes on:** In the nineties of the first century Asian Christianity was faced with disruption, and men looked to the aged John, mystic and prophet, perhaps the last survivor through all the Churches of the Mediterranean lands

* *F.G.*, pp. 479 sq.

† This last quotation is from *P.C.*, p. 97. The *formgeschichtlich*-minded might get valuable practice from a comparison of these two books.

‡ They are also missing from the Armenian, but that was made from the Syriac version, and is therefore not an independent witness. Rufinus has "*caeterique discipuli*," which looks like an early gloss. There is also a slight variation in the Gk. MSS. The *et* often printed before τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί is found only in Schwartz' MS. A. as against T, E, R, B, D, M. which omit it.

§ Mommsen, *Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, pp. 156-159.

|| P. Lagrange, O.P., *L'Évangile selon S. Jean*, p. xxxiii.

¶ Moffatt, *Introduction to Lit. of N.T.*, 1911, p. 600.

** In the next two paragraphs I have tried to condense the arguments put forward *F.G.*, chapters xv. and xvi. in my own words. The original gains much from the charm and skill of its presentation, which a *précis* cannot reproduce, but otherwise I do not think I have weakened the case.

of those who had known the Lord in the days of His flesh, burdened in his last years with the Church of the metropolis of Asia. And they did not look in vain. He met and overcame this supreme crisis—with the aid of a "mystic trance"—by becoming the first and greatest "modernist."*

The faith was then menaced on the one side by the new-risen Gnostic *docetæ* with their shadowy "emanations," who emptied of all human substance or historical significance the *Person* whom John the Elder at the least had seen as a breathing, suffering reality. On the other it was ill served by seers, still filled with all the old this-worldly Jewish mind, that saw the things of the spirit only through the veil of sensuous apocalyptic dreaming. And so we get the gospel of the Word made Flesh—all the tense sanctity and passionate brooding of a long high life flaming out into a last splendid utterance of his soul—of all that he himself had come to be only in virtue of things seen and heard in Jewry all those years ago. This gospel is the reconciliation of the fact and meaning which a later generation would have sundered—the fact real and historical, although—indeed, because—transfigured by its meaning. Thus John the Elder crowned the work of Saul of Tarsus.

It all sounds extraordinarily attractive. Even it would account for the masterful treatment accorded the Synoptics (always a difficulty with "liberal" theories). After all, unlike Mark and Luke, the pale reflections of Peter and Paul, this man *knew*—"that which our eyes have seen and hands have handled of the Word of Life."† The Fourth Gospel was indeed, as the Church has always held, a last and supremely authorized attempt to correct and supplement the Synoptists who had not been, in St. Luke's word, "autoptists," but put forward by John the Elder, the last of all those who had even *seen* the Lord.‡

Unfortunately, we happen to know something of the sort of teaching with which the Elder was accustomed to supplement his gospels. St. Irenæus, in one of his more millenarian moments, tells us that—

"... the Elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord, relate

* It is worth note that the conception of the part played by history in theology which Dr. Streeter attributes to the Elder is the precise and exact opposite of that adopted by "modernists" in the grand manner, Laberthonnière, Loisy, Le Roy, and their fellows.

† On this theory the first phrase would be strictly accurate, the second a gross exaggeration—unless we allow the twelve-year "Elder," with the curiosity of youth, to have assisted at the Descent from the Cross.

‡ Some of those who have felt the attraction of the case for the "Elder" do not seem to have realized that its strong points are simply "lifted" bodily from the case for the Apostle. On the other hand, "the Elder" has weaknesses which are quite his own.

that they had heard from him how the Lord used to teach concerning those days and to say :

“ ‘ The days shall come in which vines shall grow, each having 10,000 shoots, on each shoot 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 twigs and on each twig 10,000 clusters, and on each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape when pressed shall yield five and twenty measures of wine. And when any of the Saints shall have taken hold of one of the clusters, another shall cry, “ I am a better cluster ; take me, bless the Lord through me.” Likewise also a grain of wheat shall produce 10,000 heads, and every head 10,000 grains, and every grain ten lbs. of fine flour, bright and clean ; and other fruits, seeds and the grass shall produce in similar proportions, and all the animals, using those fruits which are products of the soil, shall become in their turn peaceable and harmonious, obedient to man in all subjection.’ ”

“ These things Papias, who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, an ancient worthy, witnesseth in writing in the fourth of his books, for there are five books by him. And he added saying :

“ ‘ But these things are credible to them that believe. And when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked, “ How shall such growths be accomplished by the Lord ? ” he relates that the Lord said, “ They shall see who shall come to these (times). ” ’ ”

It is a little difficult to believe that a mind which could relish these apocalyptic botanizings could also have produced the chapters which were to sterilize for ever the effective millenarian spirit in the Church. Even the “ mystic trance ”—into which Dr. Streeter is a little inclined to precipitate any primitive saint who shows awkward signs of orthodox doctrine or traditional behaviour†—does not really explain how this passage and the Fourth Gospel can both be products of one man’s religion.

It may be answered that St. Irenæus evidently thought them so, or quotes them as if he did ; but almost anything seems to be allowable of St. Irenæus’ literary methods, if one is sufficiently “ liberal.” Descriptions of them vary from “ audacious lie ” (E. Schwartz)‡ to “ dingy ” (Dr. Streeter).§ It is, I think, possible to show conclusively that he did, in this case, make a quite natural mistake, and that with this misunderstanding of the external evidence every trace of a common authorship vanishes.

St. Irenæus’ use of this passage of Papias does not stand

* St. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 33, 3 and 4. Translation in Lightfoot and Harmer, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1898, pp. 533 sq.

† Cf. the treatment accorded St. Ignatius, *P.C.*, pp. 165 sqq. and 228 sq.

‡ *De Pionio et Polycarpo*, Göttingen, 1905, p. 33.

§ *P.C.*, 1929, p. 94.

alone. We have a control in the accurate historian Eusebius, who had also read Papias with care, though he had no high opinion of him. In his *Ecclesiastical History* he notes that Papias wrote "five books of Expositions of Dominical Oracles," and continues:

"These Irenæus also mentions as his only writings somewhat as follows:

"And these things Papias also, who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, a man of primitive times, attests in writing in the fourth of his books. For there are five books by him."

"So indeed says Irenæus. Nevertheless Papias himself in the preface to his discourses makes it plain that he was in no sense a hearer of the holy Apostles. . . ."

And Eusebius goes on to cite the famous fragment from Papias' preface, and to state categorically that it was with John the Elder, not the Apostle, that Papias claimed, or seemed to claim, personal acquaintance.

From this certain facts may be deduced.

(1) Eusebius had read this whole passage of Irenæus with some care, since he here quotes exactly,† not from the quotation of Papias, but from Irenæus' own accompanying *dictum*. (2) Irenæus' statement that Papias was a "hearer of John" (the Apostle) was apparently provoked by finding this *logion* attributed to a John.‡ (3) Eusebius was therefore led to question Irenæus' statement that Papias knew the Apostle John and to state the true facts by his examination of this very passage. He must therefore have compared it with the original. Obviously, he did not there find anything which made it clear that it came from the Apostle. But I suspect that it was not made certain either that it came from the Elder, or he would not have felt obliged to bring evidence from another part of Papias' book to prove that the John Papias knew was not the Apostle. (4) Eusebius tells us that Papias' "curious" millenarian "parables and traditions of the Saviour," of which this is a specimen, came to him *ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου* "from unwritten tradition."§ He also tells us that John the Elder

* Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., 39, 1. Trans. by Lawler and Oulton, S.P.C.K., 1927, vol. i., p. 99.

† The surviving Latin version of St. Irenæus agrees literally with Eusebius' Greek text, despite the latter's *ὡδέ πως*.

‡ The words *ὁ μάρτυρ τοῦ κυρίου* may have been applied by Papias to the "John" whom he here cited. In this case they must be allowed to have stood in the text of his preface. On the other hand, they are one of St. Irenæus' regular ways of referring to the author of the Fourth Gospel (he uses it altogether sixteen times), and they do not stand in this passage as verbally quoted from Papias. He may have introduced them himself. If he found them in Papias his mistake was all the more natural.

§ *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., 39, 11.

was Papias' main source for *παράδοσεις*, "traditions."* It is therefore a fair argument that where we find a millenarian tradition which had reached Papias orally from a "John," we are dealing with "John the Elder" and not the Apostle or an otherwise unknown "John the Seer."†

To these arguments from Irenæus and Eusebius may be added a converging indication internal to the passage of Papias itself. This is nothing more than an elaboration of a passage from the Jewish *apocryphon* generally called *the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* or *II. Baruch*, which was put out in Hebrew somewhere between A.D. 70 and the beginning of the second century, though much of its material was common form at the time and may be older.‡ This passage is thus at once placed in close relations with the Johannine Apocalypse, which is notoriously closely affiliated to similar Jewish works. But Eusebius, who cannot with any probability be supposed to have detected this common affinity, was inclined to attribute the Apocalypse to the Elder, apparently partly on the strength of what he found in Papias.

Lastly St. Jerome tells us§ very definitely that John the Elder was a pronounced millenarian, in a passage which is not entirely dependent on Eusebius since he also cites Apollinarius the Younger of Laodicea (*ob. c. 392*). The latter was a versatile bishop, who besides being excommunicated in his youth for stopping to the end of the recitation of a hymn to Bacchus by his schoolmaster, had succeeded in getting his Christology condemned by a General Council and forming a schism.|| What is more to our purpose, Jerome tells us that he was the latest of the Asiatic millenarians. He was a student of Papias¶ and no doubt furnished St. Jerome with information on the authorities upon which the millenarian doctrine was based.* This passage of St. Jerome is cited by Dr. Streeter** to strengthen his attribu-

* *Ibid.*, iii., 39, 13.

† R. H. Charles, *Revelation*, 1920, p. lxxxiv. *sqq.*, is responsible for the apparition of this ghost. Streeter, *F.G.*, p. 469, and *P.C.*, 87 *sq.*, follows Charles in attributing to him the Apocalypse of Patmos. The only function of this transparent eponym in both writers is to receive the discredit for the millenarian apocalypse, in order that the blameless Elder may write the more or less anti-millenarian gospel.

‡ "The earth shall also yield its fruit ten thousandfold, and on one vine there shall be 1,000 branches, and each branch shall produce 1,000 clusters, and each cluster shall produce 1,000 grapes, and each grape shall produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice; moreover they shall behold wonders every day" (2 Baruch xxix., 5 and 6. Ed. and Trans. Charles, S.P.C.K., 1917).

§ *De Vir. Illustr.*, 18; cf. *In Ezech.*, cap. xxxvi.

|| He was also the author of a gospel in the form of Platonic dialogues, and part author with his father of a translation of the Psalter into Homeric verse, and a Euripidean tragedy on the Passion in which the *Mater Dolorosa* rants in language borrowed alternately from Medea and Clytemnestra.

¶ One of our few scraps of Papias is preserved in quotation in a fragment of this writer. Cf. Lightfoot and Harmer, p. 523.

** *F.G.*, p. 460 n.

tion of II. and III. John to the Elder, in order thereby to attribute the Fourth Gospel to the same writer. What Dr. Streeter forgot to mention in this note is that though St. Jerome does there attribute these two epistles to the Elder, he expressly separates their authorship from that of the Gospel and the First Epistle, which he attributes to the Apostle, and that he further attributes to the Elder that very *dogma judaicum* of the millennium which Dr. Streeter believes the author of the Fourth Gospel designed to combat.

I believe that on these grounds we are justified in taking it that St. Irenæus was in this case mistaken, and attributed to the Apostle what was in fact a tradition from "the Elder." This is not to say that he invariably made the same mistake in his statements about "John." He was not infallible, but he was not *ex officio* fallible either.*

Beside all this it is interesting to set a paragraph from Dr. Streeter. In *The Four Gospels*† he writes:

"Certainly few of the surviving fragments of Papias (including an undefined number preserved by Irenæus as 'Sayings of the Elders'), which are mainly crudely millenarian in character, suggest intimacy with the author of the Fourth Gospel; but we may probably infer that this material came mainly from Aristion,‡ for it is noticeable that Papias puts his name first. Indeed, Eusebius, if we press the strict meaning of the language used, appears to imply a distinction between 'words of the Lord' derived from Aristion, and 'traditions' [? about other matters] derived from John. After alluding to a materialistic millenarian statement attributed by Papias to our Lord,§ he then adds that Papias 'gives in his own work *other*|| accounts of words of the Lord (τῶν τοῦ κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις) on the authority of the aforementioned Aristion, and traditions (παράδοσεις) of the Elder John.' Then he at once gives us an example of such παραδόσεις from the Elder, the famous statement about the origins of Mark."

* The late Dr. Burney, in the last chapter of his *Aramaic Origins of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, 1922), suggested that St. Irenæus was not entirely in good faith in confusing the two Johns, and had some inkling of the truth that the only John of Ephesus was "the Elder." Streeter (*F.G.*, p. 444 n.) finds this insinuation of bad faith against a Doctor of the Church "attractive" but not altogether proven. It is supported (*op. cit.*, pp. 138 sq.) by comprehensive tables of St. Irenæus' references to "John," to Paul, and to others of the Twelve, designed to show that while John is styled μαθητής or *discipulus*, the others are styled Apostles. John is admittedly twice intended by the word "Apostle," and I should say more often. Some of Dr. Burney's other figures are misleading, and all references like *Adv. Hær.*, I., 25, 2 (Stieren's Ed., p. 249), *qui sunt (meliores) quam Illius discipuli, ut puta Petrus et Paulus, et reliqui apostoli . . .*, which make the argument quite worthless, are not enumerated at all.

† *F.G.* 450 n.

‡ Italics mine.

§ I suspect the passage preserved by Irenæus, which Eusebius has just been discussing.

|| Italics Dr. Streeter's.

There are certain comments on all this which would appear to be in order.

(1) Apart from the passage quoted above, *no* extant fragment of Papias is "crudely millenarian in character," or millenarian at all for that matter.*

(2) The exact limits of the passages in which St. Irenæus bases himself on "Sayings of the Elders" are hard to define. Lightfoot seems to have made them twenty-four excluding the passage cited in full above, for which Papias is definitely given as the authority. Since none of these are "crudely millenarian in character," it is a little difficult to see why they should be included, even in a bracket, in information derived from the supposedly millenarian Aristion, whose name St. Irenæus never once so much as mentions. Even suppose that Aristion was also called "the Elder," a supposition for which there is no better authority than Canon Streeter's,† the case against him here will not be greatly strengthened. The only millenarian fragment is assigned to "John the Elder." If we give "Aristion the Elder" all this non-millenarian material—*cui bono*? Will it be suggested that *he* wrote the Fourth Gospel?

(3) "Certainly" very "few" of these passages betray "intimacy with the author of the Fourth Gospel." It would be interesting to know in which of them Dr. Streeter finds suggestion of it. But if he meant "none" he might have written it without greatly weakening his case. Nor, we may add, do any of them show at first sight strong inner connection with I. Peter, which Dr. Streeter has also credited, by a "scientific guess"‡ to this same convenient Aristion. But perhaps he had been cured of his "crude millenarianism" by then, by reading his colleague, John the Elder's, gospel.

(4) The neat but flimsy construction upon διηγήσεις and παραδόσεις is rather a darkening of counsel. The two words are used vaguely in later Greek, almost as synonyms. In any case, there is no need to balance them sharply against each other here; Eusebius had felt justified in classing the contributions of *both* John and Aristion as παραδόσεις in section 7 of this chapter. Though they certainly do come "after" the mention of a

* Eusebius also tells us that P. was a millenarian, but he cites no actual evidence of it (*Eccl. Hist.*, iii., 39, 12). The presumable fragment of P. which underlies *Adv. Har.*, v. 36, 1, may conceivably have been millenarian in its original form. Its millenarianism certainly is not "crude" or even apparent in its present setting. It is only mentioned here to do Dr. Streeter the strictest justice.

† *P.C.*, p. 131. "... doubtless (!) Aristion also bore the title Elder." Papias and Eusebius both rather carefully do *not* call him so. Irenæus never mentions him. The Armenian Etchmiadzin codex cited to support this title seems to rest on Moses of Khorene, who was misled by a mispointing by the Armenian translator of the Syriac version of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*.

‡ *P.C.*, pp. 130 *sqq.*

"materialistic millenarian statement," it might have been made clearer that they come some way "after"—standing at the beginning of the next paragraph but one. Eusebius is here far more reasonably translated "Papias also records in his own work *other* [*i.e.*, different in kind to the foregoing] accounts of the words of the Lord from the aforesaid Aristion κτλ," since he is here changing the whole subject from millenarianism, in Papias and in general, which he has been discussing, to Gospel origins.

An expert *Quellenkritik* of this passage of Dr. Streeter by the new method of "scientific guesses" might establish something like the following results. Dr. Streeter wrote from Eusebius, an historian for whom he has expressed a (widely-shared) respect.* At Eusebius' reference to St. Irenæus (E.H. iii. 39, 1) he called to mind, rather vaguely, the "Fragments of Papias" and the "Sayings of the Elders" collected at the end of Lightfoot and Harmer's *Apostolic Fathers*. Of the former the only ones of much importance are drawn from this very chapter of Eusebius (save only the arresting description of the vineyard of the Saints from Irenæus), so that it was not worth while looking them up. And what Lightfoot called "The Reliques of the Elders" are uniformly pious, but rather dull; and they are, besides, printed in smaller type, which gives a general impression of unimportance. They, therefore, get set down as "mainly crudely millenarian" by a "composite photograph" with the single millenarian fragment from Irenæus. But why ascribe all the non-millenarian passages to Aristion, and on the strength of them proclaim him a "crude" millenarian, when the real culprit was obviously the Elder John? Partly because Dr. Streeter had not looked up his Irenæus; partly because he is too fine a critic to waste his time on "symbolism" or "partition" theories of the Fourth Gospel. John the Elder is a valuable alternative to the Apostle, but if Papias derived his millenarianism from the Elder, farewell to any chance of crediting that worthy with the Gospel. And Dr. Streeter allowed himself to build up a case of millenarianism against Aristion, against the whole weight of the patristic evidence so impressively cited, by methods which are not strictly those of scholarship.

It will be said that these mistakes are careless and most unfortunate, but that detailed comment is cruel. But we may imagine that were some such process to be disentangled from the writings of an Apostolic father, there would be something of an *émeute* among the gentlemen of the left. There is a faction, with which Dr. Streeter has alliances, which noisily claims the

* P.C., pp. 21 sq.

right to rehandle doctrine on the basis of its own scientific *critique* of documents. That faction has welcomed with enthusiasm* the enquiries of Dr. Streeter into Christian origins, enquiries conducted at times by methods one would have thought more apt to induce a vertigo in modern minds. It would seem that where their own anti-supernatural prepossessions are not in question, these gentlemen are as naïvely uncritical as are, *servatis servandis*, we poor reactionaries ourselves. Which does not predispose us in favour of their claim to scientific results from documents in matters of Christology.

This highly topical attempt to foist an "elder" into the claim of an Apostle has won some following among us, perhaps because it offers the attractions of a compromise, between the traditional authorship and some nameless Philonised Ephesian. It saves the ecclesiastical tradition from conscious fraud or even pseudepigraphy. But by discarding the Apostle it allows the "Liberals" to relegate the Johannine Christology, and all its implications, to the "library of devotion" (Dr. Streeter's phrasel), where, we may take it, it will trouble them less.

It is not contended that this note has any but a negative bearing on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The retirement of the Elder still leaves the field clear for those unscrupulous Ephesian saints, J1, J2 and JR; or Loisy's (and Gaius of Rome's) "Prince of Gnostics," or even Dr. Eisner's more exciting team, composed of Lazarus in a Roman gaol, a Samaritan worshipper of Simon Magus, and a Catholic editor. But all these attributions are dependent wholly on internal evidence, and can only be maintained in the teeth of all the external witness of antiquity that that Gospel was the work of a John, who lived at Ephesus somewhere about the time of Domitian. The whole beauty of John the Elder is that he will meet these facts, and that beside his comparatively robust figure the other members of the Johannine pleiad of the Liberals† seem wraith-like in the extreme.

Papias, and he alone, has preserved for us some faint memory of "the Elder." But it might be said, *pace* Eusebius, that even the famous fragment of his preface would have left it for ever doubtful whether such an ecclesiastic as "the Elder John" ever had existed as an *ens in se*. What does suffice to raise him certainly above the status of a "Liberal" ætiological myth

* Of., e.g., a review of *The Primitive Church* by the Rev. J. S. Bezzant in *The Modern Churchman*. Unfortunately I have not the number by me. It would be in the summer of 1929, probably July or August.

† F.G., p. 365.

‡ No single critic has discerned more than four "Johns," but altogether they seem to total seven.

is the attribution to him of definite παραδόσεις, such as the description of a non-teetotal paradise which attracted St. Irenæus. But Papias has told us just too much about the Elder for him to be credited with the Fourth Gospel.

I would not be thought to imply that Dr. Streeter's "testimonies" alone require cautious handling. Dr. Moffat* can make of an Arian martyrology which does not support, and a Carthaginian calendar which directly contradicts his thesis, two "early catholic calendars" which "embody the tradition" that the Apostle was martyred early, at Jerusalem. Dr. Burney† cites "Papias" as preserved in "Philip of Side" and "Georgius Hamartolus" *tout court* without the necessary explanations that this reference is to (1) an isolated fragment of what may be an eighth-century epitome of what may be a reference by the lost fifth-century *History* of Philip of Side to something in Papias,‡ and (2) to an interpolation in a single MS.§ of the ninth-century chronicle of Hamartolus, and that this interpolation seems itself to rest on the egregious epitome of Philip, and not on Papias himself. Or there are three consecutive sentences on p. 56 of Dr. Bacon's *Studies in Matthew*|| which would furnish material for another article as long as this has grown.

But I would not end controversially. The tradition of Christendom binds us all closer than some of us may think. The writing of stories of the lives of Saints with another purpose than mere history was an exercise of Christian piety before the Middle Ages were in flower. Nor are the objects of this recent hagiographic *cultus* altogether novel. In the *Roman Martyrology* for February 22nd we may read:

Salamincæ in Cypro, Sancti Aristionis, qui (ut mox memorandus Papias testatur) fuit unus de septuaginta duobus Xti. discipulis.

Hierapoli in Phrygia, beati Papicæ, ejusdem civitatis episcopi, qui Sancti Joannis Senioris auditor, Polycarpi autem sodalis fuit.

"At Salamis in Cyprus"—it was not Dr. Streeter but Cardinal Baronius who thought of that. Dr. Streeter would identify Aristion with Ariston, first bishop of Smyrna according to *Apostolic Constitutions* vii. 46.¶ Baronius, by an equally

* *Int. to Lit. of N.T.*, 1911, p. 606.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

‡ It is thus at best a fragment of a précis of a quotation of a lost work by another lost work. It contains one generally admitted blunder concerning Quadratus, but does refer to the Ephesian residence of the Apostle. Neither of these facts is mentioned, *loc. cit.*

§ *Cod. Coislinianus*, 305.

|| London, 1930. Curiously, Mr. Bezzant contributed another appreciative review to *The Modern Churchman* (April-May, 1931, pp. 101 *sqq.*) which takes no account of these violences to the evidence.

¶ *P.C.*, pp. 93 *sqq.*

brilliant conjecture, would identify him with another Ariston, who figures as that Apostle's companion in the *Acts of Barnabas*.^{*} "One of Christ's seventy-two disciples"—neither Baronius nor Streeter invented that, but the ninth-century Usuard; while in the notice of Blessed Papias we may detect the hands of Eusebius and St. Irenæus. "At Salamis in Cyprus"—"One of the seventy-two disciples"—"A boy of twelve who saw the Crucifixion"—it must be rather fun to be a Bollandist. But these little variations need not hinder the new clients of this old devotion from celebrating a really imposing *festa* in February.

GREGORY DIX
(Nashdom Abbey).

UNITY IN THE CHURCH

THERE are signs of a desire among Anglo-Catholics for greater unity, and as a means thereto more uniformity of use in celebrating the Eucharist. But the specific proposals which have been made have the fundamental defect of a lack of authority. The only liturgical reform which has the authority of the Church is the Revised Prayer Book of 1928.

Is it impossible for Anglo-Catholics to reconsider their attitude towards this book? At any rate the fact that many of them felt bound to oppose the original adoption of the book has nothing to do with the desirability of using services from it today.

To take two examples. Two of the chief reasons for opposition to the book were the question of Reservation and the use of the Athanasian Creed. Now the question of Reservation is not in the least affected by the use of the services in the book. It remains in exactly the same position whether the services are used or not. Again the use of the shortened form of the Athanasian Creed authorized by the book is purely permissive, and therefore does not either affect the use of the various services.

At present everyone makes his own variations from the 1662 book. In the revised book the Church laid down what variations were to be allowed by authority. Surely it is much better (and, indeed, the only justifiable course) to use these rather than to claim for ourselves in such matters an authority which as individuals we do not possess.

The Eucharistic prayer in the 1920 book possesses features

^{*} "At Salamis" because there the apocryphal *Acts* placed the martyrdom of St. Barnabas, and by inference his companion died there also. I am indebted for this identification to a private letter from Père H. Delehaye, S.J.

which Catholic-minded members of the Church have desired for generations. But in spite of this many Anglo-Catholics decline to use it, their reason appearing to be a supposed alteration of doctrine implied by it. This is a point which deserves a full consideration. What are the important facts?

The first is that whereas the Roman Catholic Church ascribes the consecration at the Eucharist to the use of our Lord's words "This is my Body," "This is my Blood," the Eastern Churches, on the other hand, ascribe it to the Epiclesis or Invocation of the Holy Ghost which follows later in the prayer. (It should be noticed, by the way, that the Roman doctrine does not necessarily follow from the words of the Roman Canon itself: it is, as it were, imported into it from outside.)

Now what is our attitude to this fact? For we cannot ignore it. We must face it and have a point of view about it. And this will become more and more necessary as our relations with the Eastern Churches become closer and closer. This is a very practical matter.

Surely it is not sufficient to content ourselves by saying that the former view has always been held in the Church in the West in which we were born, and that therefore we continue to hold it? This attitude, in fact, asserts that the Church in the East is wrong, and that is a thing which on our own principles we cannot take for granted. Moreover does the Holy Spirit work on a geographical basis? It is of the utmost importance to remember on this subject that however strong our convictions may be, they do not amount to *knowledge*. We do not and cannot know for certain the truth on this matter, as there has been no divine revelation about it.

It has never been revealed to us that there is a necessary form of words to be used in consecrating the Eucharist as there is in Baptism. It is perfectly clear that the New Testament narratives do not relate that our Lord used the words "This is my Body," "This is my Blood," in blessing the bread and wine, but that they were the words which He used in distributing them to the disciples.

East and West cannot both be right on this point as they contradict one another; one at least must be wrong. There is no doctrine of the undivided Church on this subject; these two doctrines have grown up and hardened and been elaborated in controversy. This controversy is both a cause and a symptom of the schism between East and West.

There can be no doubt that great harm has been done in the past by the craving for knowledge, and clear-cut decisions and opinions on matters which cannot be known for certain. And there is an invaluable legal maxim which ought always to

be borne in mind: "Hard cases make bad law." There is always a tendency to take abnormal cases and to argue back from them to the normal, whereas the abnormal ought always to be dealt with from the standpoint of the normal. To take an example: someone asks the question, "Suppose a priest were to faint or to die in the course of the Consecration Prayer: at what point in the prayer is the consecration to be considered complete? The inference is thus made that, in order to deal with a situation like this, it is necessary to settle the exact moment of consecration, although in the ordinary way there is no practical need to raise the question. But surely the right course is to start from the normal practice and doctrine, and use our reverence and common sense accordingly when the exceptional incident occurs, rather than to narrow down the former to some precise point in order to meet a situation which does not happen once in 10,000 times; more especially as our decision here, whatever it may be, can be nothing more than a guess, since we cannot have certain knowledge of that which has never been revealed to us.

Again, it is sometimes urged that the Church of England is committed to the doctrine that the consecration is exclusively effected by the words "This is my Body," "This is my Blood" because of the provisions dealing with the exceptional circumstance of a fresh consecration proving necessary. But this, again, is to argue from the abnormal to the normal. Our normal use is not merely our Lord's words, but a petition as well; and the provision for a fresh consecration cannot properly be considered apart from the fact that in such circumstances the petition has always been used already in the service.

What, then, can we do to meet the difficulty? Surely we should fall back upon what we do know. We do know for certain that the consecration is granted in answer to the prayer of the Church, whatever it may be. Why, then, instead of insisting on our belief (which is not knowledge) that the consecration is effected exclusively by one part of the prayer, should we not defer devotion, reverences, bell-ringing, etc., to the end of the prayer?

There will then be no practical need to trouble whether the prayer in the 1928 book implies a different doctrine or not. Not only would the objection to the use of this prayer be removed, but we should be doing something towards getting rid of an unnecessary and disastrous controversy between East and West. At the same time we should be setting the example of submission to authority, and of furthering unity, by making use of the most authoritative revision of our service which is open to us.

There is no question of abandoning vital principles, of tampering with the Creeds, or slighting such important doctrines as the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Baptismal Regeneration, the Sacramental nature of Holy Orders, or the like.

To those who cling to the supposed necessity of emphasizing the moment of consecration, I would commend an extract from Mr. Edmund Bishop, the Roman Catholic liturgical scholar. He is speaking of an early Eastern liturgical writer named Narsai.* "In regard to the Eucharist . . . the common people, the ignorant vulgar that filled the churches, are at the end of the fifth century, at least according to the rite followed by Narsai, in possession not merely of full ritual splendours, but also, through as it were physical acts that must strike the eye of every beholder, in actual possession of that certitude as to the 'moment of consecration' which was only to be acquired by the common Christian people in the West in the twelfth century, or at earliest in the eleventh."

If they were without this certitude for more than the first thousand years of the Church's life, how can it be essential now?

He goes on: "The second point is this (and it deserves consideration as of high religious importance): the change in tone and attitude among people assisting at the central prayer of the service, the Canon, and the change in devotional feeling, that supervened on the ceremonial and public fixation of the 'moment of consecration.' So far as the West is concerned, it is to be remembered that such ceremonial fixation took place only after the people had been accustomed for centuries to a silent recitation of the Canon, in which the decisive moment had not been marked in a way perceptible to the congregation by either change of posture or break in silence."

Further he says: "It is instructive to glance at the numerous expositions of the Roman Mass of the ninth and tenth centuries . . . any such idea as the 'moment of consecration' is not so much as thought of in them."

It ought to be borne in mind that the Eucharistic prayer really relates to happenings which, in fact, must be considered as simultaneous, but as it is impossible for all the accompanying words to be uttered simultaneously they have to follow one another in succession.

Dr. Adrian Fortescue says†: "If we remember that the whole Canon is one prayer, asking (as the Church generally does) repeatedly for one thing, it matters very little in what order these repeated petitions come. God answers one prayer by

* *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Dom Conolly, Cambridge, 1909, pp. 128-9.

† *The Mass*, A. Fortescue, Longmans, 1914, p. 347.

changing the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord, and no doubt He does so (according to our idea of time) before the whole prayer has been spoken." He goes on: "Our baptismal service is the obvious parallel case. All through it we ask God to give the child the graces which, as a matter of fact, He gives it at once at the moment at which the essential form and matter are complete. So the Ordination rite dramatically separates the elements of the priesthood (power of sacrificing, of forgiving sins) which presumably are really conferred at one moment, when the man becomes a priest. In all such cases we say that, at whatever moment of our time God gives the sacramental grace, He gives it in answer to the whole prayer, or group of prayers, which, of course, take time to say."

Another parallel familiar to us, of course, is the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, and the prayer which follows.

It is therefore possible to attach too much importance to the order of the prayer. It is not really an essential matter. But on the other hand, since some order must be adopted, it is surely very desirable to follow an order which is both reasonable and in accordance with Catholic tradition.

Now a study of the ancient liturgies shows that they all do follow such an order in a remarkable way. They follow it with varying degrees of fulness and clearness, but the same order is observable everywhere. It follows the plan of salvation thus: The Eucharistic prayer speaks of the perfections of the Blessed Trinity, of the praise offered by the heavenly host, of the work of creation, of the Redemption as foreshadowed in the Old Testament and as the object of the Advent of our Lord, of the Institution of the Eucharist, of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension; while Pentecost is represented in due sequence by the recognition of the work of the Holy Ghost in the Epiclesis. This order obtains not merely in the Eastern liturgies, but in the Western as well, even in the Roman.

It is clear, therefore, that to insert the Invocation of the Holy Spirit before the account of the Institution of the Eucharist, as was done in the First Prayer Book, is like making Whit Sunday come before Good Friday.

Monsignor Duchesne, the great Roman Catholic liturgical writer, has pointed out that the Roman Canon contains an Epiclesis in the same place as the other ancient liturgies. He says*: "This prayer is far from exhibiting the precision of the Greek formularies, in which there is a specific mention of the grace prayed for—that is, the intervention of the Holy Spirit to effect the transformation of the bread and wine into the

* *Christian Worship*, L. Duchesne, S.P.C.K., 1919, p. 181.

Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. It is nevertheless true that (1) it occupies, in regard to the subject-matter and the logical connection of the formulary, the exact place of the Greek Epiclesis, and (2) it is also a prayer to God for His intervention in the mystery." And he goes on to point out that it is not till these words have been used that the oblation is called the Body and Blood of Christ.

Moreover, it is surely not without importance that the same order of the prayer was adopted nearly two centuries ago by the Church in Scotland, a century and a half ago by the Church in America, and in the present century by the Church in South Africa. Moreover, the ordinary Eastern forms of the consecration prayer are used by thousands of Christians in the Eastern Uniat Churches.

By the adoption of the practice here suggested we should be doing something, however small, to remove a controversy which ought never to have existed between East and West. And we should be setting an example of obedience to due authority which would meet with a generous response from those of our fellow-Churchmen who are opposed to us in many ways.

Let us make sure that we are not taking up the inconsistent attitude of on the one hand praying for the unity of the Church, and on the other of making up our minds that we ourselves will do nothing to assist the cause.

E. G. P. WYATT.

DOCTRINE AND EXPERIENCE IN CHRISTIAN LIFE

DURING recent years there has been evidence of a growing interest in the question as to the relevance "religious experience" may have in relation to the objective status of dogma. Mr. Spens, and others whose attitude is rather critical of his, have thrown considerable light on certain points which must be considered in the discussion of this question. The matter is far from being one of merely academic interest, the exclusive concern of students of the philosophy of religion. It strikes to the root of actual personal religion and raises issues which are of vital consequence in the practical intercourse of Christian life. Briefly and practically expressed, the question is the following: "If a certain belief or system of beliefs is accepted on grounds of historical evidence and philosophical argument, or even tradition and authority, and is made part of the general

background of life, may effects which the belief may be judged to induce, viewed dispassionately and objectively, be taken as affording additional justification for the acceptance of the belief, over and above the historical, metaphysical, or other basis which was its starting point? Or does any such experience of the effect of belief in our life merely reinforce our internal (psychic) feeling of *certitude*, giving no further contribution to the already possessed element of objective (psychological) *certainty*?"* It will be noticed that there is no attempt in the statement just given to define "religious experience." It is desirable to keep the discussion on the most general ground possible, thus avoiding difficulties and objections which, arising from more limited definitions, are irrelevant to the broader issues considered in this article.

It must be emphasized that there is no attempt to displace historical evidence and to substitute for it purely pragmatic grounds of belief. But it must be recognized that in Christian dogma we are dealing not merely with historical fact, but with this together with a high element of interpretation in the light of Christian experience *actually experienced* at some time or other. A recent criticism of Mr. Spens' position† seems to avoid the fact that dogma as it comes to us is something more than the historical facts which are its nuclei, and that it is the superadded interpretative element in it which is related to Christian experience. The question is largely one of the status of that particular interpretation of history which is the vital ingredient of dogma, and of the information which *present* Christian experience can give as to its correctness. In addition it may be permissible to argue that the evidence for the acceptance of an alleged fact as historical—which evidence can never be coercive—is reinforced by the testimony of present experience arising from adherence to a dogmatic position involving the truth of the alleged fact. At all events, this possibility cannot be ruled out on *a priori* grounds.‡

The student of religion, casting his mind's eye around for some methodological principle to be the basis of the discussion of the evidential value of religious experience, cannot fail to be attracted by the procedure used in the natural sciences. In that realm of study any hypothesis is judged as to its correctness by the adequacy with which it can account for the results

* This distinction of use between *certitude* and *certainty* is adopted by Dr. Tennant. See *Philosophical Theology*, vol. i., pp. 290 ff.

† Mr. Conway Davies in *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1930.

‡ Compare the verification of some event in past history in connection with recent astronomical evidence of contemporary phenomena (e.g., an eclipse). The evidence of history is unaltered, but it is corroborated from other sources. There is, however, no suggestion of a direct analogy between this and the question discussed above.

of experiment, and by the fertility with which it can suggest new lines of experimentation. There is, in fact, "give and take" between theory and experience. Can this principle be adapted to the needs of religious philosophy? Is there, in fact, a science of religion with methods analogous to or at least comparable with those of the science of the natural world? Mr. Spens has suggested that on the whole there is an analogy between the relation of hypothesis to experimental experience in science, and that of doctrine to religious experience in religion;* and that as a theory in science derives its authority from the experimental evidence with which it is in accord, so in religion a doctrine derives authority from the religious experience with which it is connected. A modification has to be made owing to the undoubted fact that it is sometimes possible to derive the religious experience usually associated with a particular doctrinal outlook without recourse to belief in that doctrine. To meet this fact, it is suggested that the doctrine "mediates" the experience through the agency of a "mental attitude" normally derived from belief in the doctrine, but obtainable in certain circumstances without it. A dogma will acquire authority (on this view) from the degree (possibly unique) to which it possesses the power to give the mental attitude conducive to the experience in question. Suggestions on similar lines to these have been made by Mr. Milburn.† With this writer the mental attitude seems to be regarded as more fundamental than the doctrinal position from which it is derived, the status of the latter being regarded rather as utilitarian. But in the discussion of religious experience it is admitted that what is called "theoid" experience is vitally necessary to the fullest and best experience in life, and further that the most efficacious means of producing this experience (which, after all, is a mental attitude "in action") is by belief in God. The real question is whether the fact that the presence of a particular content in dogma induces an efficacious mental attitude to a degree which is unique, does or does not have something to say as to the truth of the particular dogmatic content. One of the unavoidable conclusions from even slight pastoral experience is that the intellectual basis of belief is by no means necessarily the most effective factor in Christian life. Many of those whose actual lives are the most potent witness to the effect of Christian belief on life have a far from adequate basis for this belief—if the point of view taken is that the intellectual is the only basis possible. The pure in heart rather than the subtle in mind are those who see God. Conversion to

* See *Belief and Practice*, second edition, 1917.

† See *Logic of Religious Thought*, 1929.

the Christian view of life seems always to involve reference somewhere or other to this fact of the dependence of Christian life on Christian belief.

Starting with the attempt to derive some method of handling the problem of doctrine and experience from consideration of scientific method, a definite objection is encountered that the material to be handled in the two cases of religion and science is so different that there really can be no comparison of method. It is urged that the data of science possess a status in the objective world which renders them available for investigation to all who may choose to investigate them, quite apart from any antecedent belief as to their existence or nature; while, in contrast with this, religious experience is dependent for its very existence on antecedent belief, and thus cannot rightly be used, as the data of science are used, to give reinforcement to the antecedent hypothesis. It is also urged that the data given by religious experience are peculiarly restricted to the individual, and cannot be compared with the supra-individual objective data which are given by the "facts" of science. So that while it is reasonable to argue from the objective character of scientific data to the truth of scientific theory, it is only permissible to argue in the case of the individual religious experience to a psychic status internal to the individual and not to one of objective truth. If this objection is valid, it is hard to see what evidential value religious experience can possess. And it is to the consideration of this objection that we must turn. There are, indeed, further objections that religious experience is simply due to auto-suggestion, that intense expectation of experience produces the experience. Some experience can be explained in this way, but not all. As Mr. Spens has emphasized,* the force that this objection seems to have disappears when it is remembered that religious experience depends on the type as well as the intensity of the belief. Not every belief, however strongly held, will produce religious experience. This fact, coupled with the further fact that when experience does follow on belief it is often of a kind not anticipated and may be of a very varied type, shows that the mere mental process of suggestion is not a sufficient explanation of religious experience.

The objection, however, which has to be met is that it is the *quality* of the belief which causes the experience, that certain beliefs (*e.g.*, in the existence of God) give rise to religious experience by virtue of the nature (apart from the objective existence) of the object believed in. It is the *idea* of the object rather than its existence which causes the experience. If this objection is of universal application, objective existence can never be

* *Loc. cit.*, p. 34 ff.

argued from religious experience. As in the case of the previous objection on the grounds of auto-suggestion, it is to be admitted that some experience is explained in the way suggested. But this fact no more implies that all experience in religion is so explained, than does the recognition that *some* physical experience is illusion or hallucination imply that it *all* is.

The discussion at this point is best pursued by a brief examination of the meaning of "object" and "objectivity" as used in science. The objective character of the "facts" which constitute the data of science, their independence of the limitations of individual experience, is often held up in contrast with the confinement of religious experience to the individual. But if we are to compare with fairness the data available in the two realms of science and religion, we must compare them both on the basis of *actual experience*. The so called "objects" of the physical world with which science concerns itself are conceptual and not perceptual; they never have been part of actual experience. Whatever objectivity they possess is derived by the application (possibly implicit) of interpretative categories of thought to individual experience; it is not given with self-evident unavoidableness by the experience itself. The whole process of interpretation and the categories used in it are gradually developed and acquired from the earliest age through actual experience. The object used in the physical sciences as fundamental is not the datum of unsophisticated experience which it is sometimes assumed to be; it is the result of intercourse between the individual experients. It is possible without logical inconsistency for the individual to argue that he and his experience alone constitute reality. If it be just to infer, from the fact that religious experience depends on the belief with which it corresponds, that the belief is the sole cause of the experience, then it may with equal force be contended that because our physical experience (visual, oral, tactual, etc.) depends on the existence of the corresponding sense organs (the eye, the ear, the skin, etc.), therefore the physical experience is caused solely by the organs themselves, and cannot be used as evidence for the existence of a world external to the individual. In the interpretation of physical experience in terms of an objective world there is a large "alogical" element which falls short of the coercively logical. The "objects" of science are abstract concepts derived from this product of interpretation. If science be based on such a foundation, need we be surprised if the findings of religious experience lack coercive certainty? Solipsism is not a prevalent metaphysical standpoint; we do not question the evidential value of our experience for the existence and nature of a real world; but we have a warning

against naïve Positivism in the experience of illusion and hallucination. We can only decide the status of the evidential claims of part of experience by reference to the whole. It is the element of coherence in our experience which demands reference to an objective existence, and it is by reference to this coherence that the claims of any single experience to be due to the objective world are to be judged. We must "prove the spirits," both in physical experience and in religious experience, and we must rightly be critical of the extensive claims of any instance or type of religious experience. It is only in the unity of Faith and Life in the Catholic Church that we can fully relate our own experience to its proper context and estimate its basis in objective reality. But, that religious experience as a whole has its roots in objective reality and is of evidential value in connection with it, we can no more deny than we can in the case of physical experience. Religious experience is really a "misnomer." We have *experience* pure and simple; and there are elements in it which in virtue of the interpretations they demand are termed physical and religious. As to communicability they are on the same level. One individual can never convey to another his own experience as he actually experiences it. I do not know that my sensation of redness is the same as that of someone else; but when I experience redness, other individuals also have corresponding experiences which they *call* "red." And so intersubjective intercourse is possible, and not merely in matters of physical experience, but in religious experience too. Nor is there any watertight partition between the two. The effects of belief are not confined to individual religious experience, but can be observed in the everyday* Objective World of social intercourse into which our physical experience is conceptually transferred.

We must distinguish two problems: the one, which has so far concerned us in this discussion, as to whether behind experience there is an objective reality; the other, with which science concerns itself, as to the detailed information that experience can give as to the nature of this reality, assuming its existence as justified by discussion of the previous problem. Now science itself cannot give information as to the objective world behind experience; it can only give insight into the adequacy of hypothesis in relation to experiment on the plane of the conceptual Objective World of public Objects. It is the function of metaphysics, with its interpretative categories developed in the plane of actual experience, to make what further steps can be made from the conceptual and abstract

* The use of capital and small letters to distinguish reference to conceptual objects and real objects is Dr. Tennant's (*loc. cit.*, p. 20).

results of science to the real objective world. *In itself* the "verification" of theory by experiment in science tells nothing of the existence or nature of an objective world, outside the individual subject.

Now with religious experience the significant relations are different. We do not form (to any extent) an abstract conceptual Reality comparable with the External World of science. We deal, in the main, directly with experience; so that any close analogy between the relation of antecedent belief to the experience caused in the sphere of religion and the connection of theory and experiment in science is not to be expected. Yet if, as we have contended, religious experience induced by belief, taken as a whole, tells us something of the status of the reality believed in, it is likely that the religious experience judged to be induced by particular details of belief will give some insight into the status of the particular details of reality relevant to the particular belief. It is in this connection that the concept of "mental attitude" is of value. The function of dogma is to stimulate "mental attitude" in consequence of which the religious experience ensues. But the mental attitude must not be conceived as a passive state of mind, but rather as an active attitude of will.* The real and evident difference between a living faith and a mere assent to dogma lies in the existence in the first case of the "mental attitude" which leads to religious experience. Belief, to be effective in the production of religious experience, requires the stimulation of the complementary mental attitude: and although, as we have noted, a mental attitude can sometimes give rise to the experience even when the normally antecedent dogmatic basis is absent or severely modified, such cases are generally "parasitic" of the normal case, and have no more significance than hallucinations in physical experience. What seems to happen is this: that in order to live in the environment which is ours in this life in the best possible way, we must have a certain "outlook on life," a certain mental "position" or "attitude," which must govern our life. We find that the requisite attitude is stimulated to a degree that is unique by the acceptance of a certain fairly well defined dogmatic position as to the objective reality underlying the world. There is thus a direct connection between this accepted reality and the actual objective environment in which we live. And we thus relate the objective reality given in the dogma to the reality behind our environment. If we consider the effect of some particular doctrine in the production of religious experience by the mediation of a corresponding mental attitude, we must include the general

* Conway Davies, *loc. cit.*, p. 21.

reaction on our whole experience as well as the specific effect on the particular way considered. As Mr. Spens has pointed out,* the status of a particular belief may be vitiated by harmful general reaction, even when the specific effect is desirable. But with such safeguards we may relate particular elements of the objective reality postulated by the dogmatic outlook with the reality which is our environment in life. This methodological principle will not give a concise analytical formulation of reality comparable in precision with the theories of science established by experiment. For science, and all connected immediately with it, is on the abstract plane, and its precision and analytical character is at the expense of abstractness from actuality; while the essential character of dogma is to be significant for actual life and experience, for which purpose a purely analytical formulation is not the best expression of belief. In Christian doctrine we have a body of statements which must be taken as a whole, because the value of any one statement depends on its relation to the others. Individual details, if taken out of their context in the whole, may seem to be contradictory. Hence the real danger of heresy arising not from deliberate untruth but from misapplied emphasis of one section of doctrine as opposed to others. And since the complex of mental attitudes necessary for the right experience in life depends on the *relation* of details of belief as well as on the details themselves, heretical doctrine will lead to vitiated and warped experience. Dogma is thus not a collection of just so many assertions about objective reality as are requisite to account for religious experience so far. The analogy here with science breaks down entirely. We may perhaps draw a comparison with the intuitions of certain eminent men of science, intuitions which at the time when they were first propounded as theories were not founded on experimental evidence. The Electromagnetic theory of Light propounded in 1867 by Clerk-Maxwell is a notable example of this. The theory gave an increased insight into optical phenomena and yet remained without direct experimental verification of any kind until the experiments of Hertz in 1888. We may compare this insight into phenomena with the "mental attitude" in relation to life; but there is no direct analogy. The only analogy possible is the one between religious experience and the objective reality asserted to exist by dogma, and physical experience and the external objective world arising from the interpretation of it. Neither the real world nor the reality behind dogma can be described adequately by means of a collection of mutually consistent analytical statements. If the attempt be made to

* THEOLOGY, 1925, October, p. 19.

do this in the case of dogma the result is not adequate for the stimulation of the necessary mental attitude appropriate to the fullest experience in life. We have to recognize that the philosophy of religion by itself is not capable of determining Christian dogma. It can only lay down conditions which must be satisfied by any dogmatic system which is advanced. Thus it may happen that a dogmatic system advanced solely on metaphysical grounds may prove much less adequate than one which ignores some of the necessary conditions. For the latter system will give the mental attitude in a way which the former will not, although it will lead to undesirable inhibitions (*e.g.*, of an intellectual type). This is the explanation of the real appeal of "Fundamentalism" at the present time. For many, the choice which presents itself is that between an inadequate dogmatic position with a reasonable basis, and a position which is inconsistent in some particulars with the conditions which must be satisfied by one which claims to be reasonable and which yet is more or less adequate to the purpose of inducing religious experience. That this is not the true state of affairs it is the duty of the Church to proclaim, and never more so than at present. It must be made known that in the Catholic Faith is offered a dogmatic position which need fear no intellectual criticism or investigation, and which is unique in its power to guide us on the road "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

C. D. WADDAMS.

RELIGION AND POETRY IN WILLIAM COWPER

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE TEMPLE CHURCH ON NOVEMBER 22, 1931, THE BICENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF COWPER, BY THE MASTER OF THE TEMPLE (REV. S. C. CARPENTER)

1 Cor. xiv. 15: "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

THAT the arts are neighbours of religion, that in particular they march with Christianity and have a bearing on Christian worship, is manifest to all. Not everyone will be agreed on the delimitation of the boundaries, or on the precise language with which the ambassadors of the one should hail the advances or reply to the questions of the other. But that there is common ground is common ground. The terms of the league of amity are not fixed, and can never be permanently fixed; but the

necessity of a league, or at all events of the league spirit, is not to be denied.

Among the arts is that of literature, and above all that of poetry. What is the relation here? It happens that poets of the first rank are very few, and that they place themselves in this matter very clearly. There are only two supreme Christian poems, the *Divine Comedy* and *Paradise Lost*, and it will be commonly allowed that both are raised to a higher power by the sublimity of their great argument. It is that, rather than sheer natural faculty, which lifts Dante and Milton into the company of Homer and Shakespeare. So, in a different vein, Æschylus, as poet, surpasses his two rivals, not, it may be, in utter poetical capacity, but rather by virtue of his religious faith.

On this anniversary of the birth of William Cowper, born in November, 1731, and a member of both the "two learned and honourable societies of this House," we are thinking not of poets of the first rank, nor even of the second, of a Wordsworth or a Browning, but of the third. Does the religion of such singers clip the wings of their poetic fancy, or does it send them on a larger flight?

There is indeed much poor and conventional religious verse, some of it by men who elsewhere are capable of poetry. But where this is so, there is a fault in the religion. True religion never spoiled a poet's work, and it has often multiplied his power. This has not always been conceded. Johnson, whom Cowper admired, though he pokes some fun at his prose style, said in his *Life of Waller* that "Poetical devotion cannot please. Contemplative piety cannot be poetical. Faith, invariably uniform, cannot be invested by fancy with decorations. Thanksgiving, the most joyful of all holy effusions, is confined to a few modes, and is to be felt rather than be expressed. The ideas of Christian theology are too simple for eloquence, too sacred for fiction, and too majestic for ornament; to recommend them by tropes and figures is to magnify by a concave mirror the sidereal universe." It is a clumsy judgment, dressed out with unconvincing epigrams; but Johnson, to do him justice, was thinking for the most part of men who had produced, amid much else, a few "Sacred Pieces." His "Lives" did not include Crashaw, Donne, Herbert, Traherne (of whose poems he could not have known), or Henry Vaughan.

What of the more recent religious poets—Newman, Keble, Coventry Patmore, George Macdonald, Christina Rossetti, Francis Thompson, Alice Meynell? There will be some to whom Thompson, picturing the sunrise in terms of Mass and Benediction, will seem to have measured the greater by the

smaller, but he is a bold critic who maintains that Thompson is less of a poet because he is devout. It is difficult to imagine Newman, though R. H. Hutton speaks of his "exquisite and almost Æschylean genius," spending his gifts on anything but that which would serve the cause of the altar and the pulpit. In fact, Hutton's eulogy occurs in a context of wonder at the devotion to a mission which made him pour out Tracts and Histories of the Arians and essays on the *Via Media* after he had discerned in himself the power to write such poems as *The Elements—A Tragic Chorus*. He could have done almost anything, but, like St. Paul, he has determined to know one thing alone. Keble, a smaller man, is more to the point. He is a clear example of the man, not a poet by nature, who yet became a poet by grace. He attains the level of a true poetry by virtue of the inspiration of his subject and his whole-souled absorption in it. In the others named, all poets of the true breed, nature is nevertheless assisted; they reach heights, or depths, to which their own insight would never have carried them.

At what height will Cowper finally be seen? He knew that he was not

"the bard all fire,
Touched with a coal from heaven
With more than mortal music on his tongue."

but was he less, or more, of a poet because, according to his gift, he prophesied? Cowper will always be loved, because we have compassion for his misery, and we sing his hymns. But was he limited or helped by his religion?

In the first place, his religion did not send him mad. A critic, whose sweeping judgments are always interesting but not always based on complete knowledge, has said that he was "almost damned by John Calvin, and saved by John Gilpin." His latest biographer, Lord David Cecil, says that "religion, so far from being the cause, was the most considerable of the remedies which he tried to get rid of it," even though the remedy, as administered by Newton, was itself something of an irritant. He says himself:

"I was a stricken deer, that left the herd
Long since: with many an arrow deep infix'd
My panting side was charged, when I withdrew,
To seek a tranquil death in distant shades.
There was I found by one who had himself
Been hurt by the archers. In his side he bore,
And in his hands and feet, the cruel scars.
With gentle force soliciting the darts,
He drew them forth and heal'd, and bade me live."

It is clear that there were definite periods in his life. The Huntingdon and early Olney period was the time, just after his first recovery, when, in the first warm rush of the Evangelicalism learned under good Dr. Cotton at St. Albans, he could think and speak of nothing but religion, when he writes to his cousin, "To find those whom I love clearly and strongly persuaded of Evangelical truth, gives me a pleasure superior to any this world can afford." To the latter part of this period, when that infirmity, which

"of all maladies that man infest,
Claims most compassion, and receives the least,"

was threatening him again, and his religion was failing to prevent it, belong the Olney Hymns. Many of them are commonplace. It would be hard indeed to write nearly seventy hymns to order in a comparatively short time, and even apart from the frequent state of the poet's own mind, the taste of his age was for hymns in a melancholy vein. The worst of them is far better than Sternhold and Hopkins. The most famous and the last of all was written when during a solitary walk across the fields he had a presentiment that his affliction was inevitably coming back. It is a grand, simple hymn, on which any poet's credit might be content to stand:

"God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants his footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm."

He called it *Light Shining out of Darkness*. Towards the end of the period of affliction that followed, the other side of the picture is seen for a moment in some lines addressed to Newton, on his return from a visit to the sea:

"To me the waves, that ceaseless broke
Upon the dangerous coast,
Hoarsely and ominously spoke
Of all my treasure lost."

"Your sea of troubles you have past,
And found the peaceful shore;
I, tempest-toss'd, and wrecked at last,
Come home to port no more."

Poor Cowper! His answer to the everlasting question, whenever he was his true self, was the Everlasting Yea. But there were long times, days, months, and even years, when he was haunted by most cruel and dreadful spectres of the mind,

and he was not then himself. In his right mind he knew that—

“Affection lights a brighter flame
Than ever blazed by art.”

And at a higher level he knew that the unfailing charity of John Thornton, whose almoner at Olney he sometimes had been, was—

“no sudden start,
After long sleep of passion in the heart,
But steadfast principle, and in its kind
Of close alliance with th’ eternal mind.”

During the later part of his active life his faith was less what was then called Evangelical, and quieter and more equable. To this time belongs that great poem *The Task*, in which he said nearly all he knew. Here is one passage from it, which shows that love of freedom which, for all his retirement from affairs and for all his love of the parlour and the fireside and the teacups, was one of the passions of his quiet life. He says somewhere that he would rather be a slave than have one. It shows also something else. The vice of eighteenth-century theology was what might be called its dualism. It cut the world in half, and was inclined to render to Nature the things which were Nature’s and to God only those things which it thought were God’s. An early biographer of Cowper himself, adapting Hayley’s Life “to the demands and expectations of the religious public,” observes that “Cowper never fails to introduce the Creator into the scenes of His own universe.” The great Bishop Butler was not free from this dualism, and even Coleridge, who led English theology out of the eighteenth century into the nineteenth, who is being hailed by many as our best guide for today, has here and there a touch of it. It was the manner of Cowper’s time, but it is the vice which has made some believe that religion is destructive of poetry, and of other things. Cowper transcends it in these lines. They occur towards the end of the fifth book of *The Task*. Patriots, he says, have toiled and their names are held in honour:

“But martyrs struggle for a brighter prize,
And win it with more pain. Their blood is shed
In confirmation of the noblest claim—
Our claim to feed upon immortal truth,
To walk with God, and be divinely free.
He is the freeman whom the truth makes free,
His are the mountains, and the valleys his,
And the resplendent rivers. His to enjoy
With a propriety that none can feel,
But who, with filial confidence inspired,
Can lift to heaven an unpresumptuous eye,
And smiling say—‘My Father made them all.’

Are they not his by a peculiar right,
And by an emphasis of interest His?

Ye will not find

In feast or in the chase, in song or dance,
A liberty like his who, unimpeach'd
Of usurpation, and to no man's wrong,
Appropriates nature as his Father's work,
And has a richer use of yours than you."

It may be illustrated if it be allowed to change some familiar words in the Venite in order to mark a contrast which was not intended by the Psalmist but has truth in it. It is good to be the sheep of His pasture, but a richer use of God's general creation is enjoyed by those who know that they are the people of His hand. It is—to use a word of quantity—everything to have been created. Yes, everything, in quantity. Yet there is a further quality of richness, of colour, of intensity, which illuminates the life of the redeemed.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of *Winchester Cathedral Introits*, of which a certain number of lithographed copies are available for sale from Messrs. Warren and Sons, High Street, Winchester, at 2s. 6d. each. The settings of these Introits, which vary with the seasons, are by Dr. Prendergast, Organist and Master of the Choristers at Winchester Cathedral; and they have been greatly appreciated.

NOTE

THE ORTHODOX PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMY, AND ITS EXERCISE

I. THE TERM ECONOMY

THE usage of the term Economy by Orthodox writers is not confined to relaxations of the canons and common laws of the Orthodox Church in its dealings, corporately or individually, with the non-Orthodox.

That usage is only secondary, and when so applied, the term is in no way separable from its primary usage in Orthodox theology.

In the widest sense, mankind is the *oikos*, the family, of God, of which His Will and Purpose are the *nomos*, the creative, sustaining, regulative principle.

In general, therefore, the operation of God in relation to mankind is to be termed *oikonomia*—His dealing with His family according to the law of His Will and Purpose.

In particular, however, the term is applied to God's dealings with men as mediated in and through the Church.

To men those dealings are in apparent antinomy.

The Law of God's Justice is absolute and admits of no exception. To contravene His Will is to be cut off from Him. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. But the Law of God's Love has another logic.

Accordingly, while, Christ being the *oikonomos*, by whom the Law of God's Will is mediated in the *oikos* of the Christian Church, *oikonomia* covers every aspect of the Christian dispensation, it always connotes the condescension—*sunkatabasis*—towards human infirmity by which Divine Love reconciles Divine Justice.

By the strictness—*akribeia*—of God's Justice the universality of sin had made mankind incapable of being His family. But in His tender Love for mankind—*philanthropia*—God sent His Son into the world to redeem the world.

In the Redemption wrought by Christ, both the Justice and the Love of God are satisfied, and it is described, therefore, by many Orthodox writers *kat' exochen*, as the *Oikonomia*, the supreme operation of the Law of God's Will in which that Justice and Love are in perfect unity.

II. THE PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMY IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

(In reading this and the following sections, it should be remembered that Orthodox theology has not been systematized and formulated as Latin theology has been, and that in this matter Orthodox writers of authority at times diverge from each other in their premises, their treatment and conclusions. What appears below may be taken, I think, as a sufficiently accurate representation of the matter.)

It is in and through the whole body of the Church individually and collectively that in general Christ, the *oikonomos*, exercises His *oikonomia*. But it is through the organs of the Church, the Sacred Ministry, and, above all, the Apostolic Episcopate, that He exercises it in particular.

The Church is, therefore, fully *tamiouschos*, possessed of stewardship in her own household, and in her exercise of *oikonomia*, *philanthropia* must relax *akribeia* for the good of human souls and for her own cause, whenever need demands and the condescension is possible.

For our present purpose, Economy may thus be defined as an exercise of her stewardship by the Church whereby that which by the strict letter of her law is forbidden, is permitted.

Thus Theophylact of Bulgaria (*Comment. Epist. Gal. v.*) writes: "He who does anything by Economy, does not do it as being good in itself, but as being needful for the occasion."

III. THE EXERCISE OF ECONOMY

I venture to be doubtful as to whether the theory of Economy among the Orthodox is in any way comparable to the theory of Dispensation among the Latins.

At any rate, it has nothing juridical about it. Neither can its exercise be codified.

Of the necessity of the case, even if it does not postulate a supersession of law, any and every exercise of Economy transcends law; for the active principle in Economy is not Justice, but Love. Just as Christ's Redemption, the divine *philanthropia*, transcended the *akribeia* of divine Justice, and in virtue of His "condescension"—*sunkatabasis*—was not inconsistent with it but was complementary to it, so in every case in which special circumstances touching either the mystic life of the Orthodox Church itself or its contacts, individual or collective, with those who do not belong to its *communio in sacris*, bring *akribeia* into seeming conflict with *philanthropia*, then, so long as it does not negate that which is revealed, the Law of Love is free to govern the decision. But as soon as the particular occasion for any Economy has passed, *akreibia* re-enters into complete possession.

Every exercise of Economy stands by itself.

Precedents or their absence will have weight in the decision of those who are called on to decide whether or not to exercise it. But no precedents can bind that decision. Indeed, strictly speaking, there can be no real precedents for any Economy. That *akribeia* has been relaxed in the case of an individual or a group in a particular matter, emboldens *philanthropia* to relax it in the same matter in another case. But for *philanthropia* the need for Economy may be decided according to its judgment on the one hand of the need of the individual, and on the other hand of the well-being of the Church.

An Economy exercised in a particular case may thus be refused in another in which the circumstances appear closely analogous. And an Economy the exercise of which habitually has been authorized for individuals or groups of individuals may be ceased at any time.

In brief, *philanthropia* is constrained to exercise any and every Economy which it judges to be for the salvation of an individual soul or for the welfare of the Church and of the Kingdom of Christ.

But it is constrained to refuse any and every Economy which it judges would be injurious to the welfare of the Church.

IV. THE LIMITS OF ECONOMY

Of necessity, the Church can only exercise Economy in regard to the laws and customs which, having herself prescribed, she can change. She cannot exercise it in regard to that which Christ Himself has revealed and ordained.

That is to say, no exercise whatever of Economy is possible in the dogmatic sphere.

Accordingly, a paramount requirement for every exercise of Economy is that it shall in no wise compromise or appear to compromise the dogmatic tradition of the Church.

V. THE MODE OF THE EXERCISE OF ECONOMY

From what has been said above, it will be plain that the immediate decision as to whether a particular Economy is to be exercised in a particular case rests with the person who exercises it.

But if *akribeia* is to be relaxed by *philanthropia*, its relaxation must not be the arbitrary action of an individual.

Thus, while in pressing emergency a layman, a priest or a bishop must employ his own discretion, in doing so he must not forget that he acts as the *okonomos* of the Church, and he must not exercise Economy in a manner which he has reason to think would not be authorized by those to whom he is subordinate.

Thus, except by the authority of an Œcumenical Council, or at least of the unanimous consent of the Synods of all the autokephalous Churches, Economy cannot rightly be exercised even by a Patriarch in Synod or the Synod of a single Church, in regard to the canons of the Œcumenical Councils and the traditional common law and customs of the whole Orthodox Church.

Again, no individual bishop, and probably not even a Patriarch, would be right to exercise Economy in a manner which was disapproved by the Synod of his particular Church. Nor would a priest or layman be right to do so in a manner which their bishop would disapprove.

Philanthropia can justify Economy only so long as it does not produce *anomia*.

VI. THE EXERCISE OF ECONOMY IN REGARD TO THOSE NOT IN THE COMMUNION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

By the 10th of the so-called Canons of the Apostles, which the 2nd Canon of the Sixth Œcumenical Council invests with Apostolic authority, the members of the Church are forbidden even to pray with anyone who is *akoinotos*—out of its Communion.

According to *akribeia*, therefore, no spiritual intimacy is permissible between a member of the Orthodox Church and anyone not of its Communion.

That that canon is based on disciplinary and not on dogmatic grounds is plain from particular relaxations made by the Œcumenical Councils. And it is taken for granted today that, unless prohibited by competent authority, the Orthodox laity no less than the clergy are free at discretion to exercise Economy in the matter.

Thus it is frequent and normal for them to attend the Eucharist of non-Orthodox Churches alike as an act of worship and as a ceremonial act of comity and amity.

It must be noted, however, that when the conditions which justify the exercise of Economy cease, *akribeia* re-enters.

Accordingly, if the appropriate authority prohibited the relaxation of the Canon in question, that prohibition would restore its stringency.

VII. ECONOMY IN REGARD TO SACRAMENTS ADMINISTERED OUTSIDE THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

For the understanding of the Orthodox view of sacraments administered outside the Orthodox Church, which identifies itself exclusively with the one Catholic Apostolic Church, it should be noted that St. Augustine's influence in the East, where in comparison with St. Basil he is a secondary authority, has always been, and remains, small.

Those Orthodox writers who incline to hold that the charisma of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders is indelible cannot maintain that those sacraments must be recognized as valid *per se* when administered outside the Church.

On the contrary, St. Basil laid it down that "those who are severed from the Church, having become laymen, have no power to baptize or ordain, and cannot confer that Grace of the Holy Spirit from which they have fallen away" (*Migne xxxii. 669*).

The 46th and 47th of the Apostolic Canons, which order Baptism and Orders when administered outside the Church to be repeated, govern the position, and from the time of St. Cyprian instances of such repetition are abundant.

If, on the other hand, instances such as that provided by the Third Œcumenical Council are equally abundant of the reception during the first eight centuries of heretics and schismatics in their Baptism and Orders, their reception was an exercise of Economy, and the declaration of the Seventh Œcumenical Council that clergy who renounce their heresy are to be received as clergy is also shown to be such by the qualification "provided there be no other hindrance."

But Economy cannot override dogma. It cannot pronounce that to be a sacrament which dogma denies to be a sacrament nor deny that to be a sacrament which dogma pronounces to be a sacrament.

Accordingly, *akribeia* does not prescribe the repetition of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders administered outside the Church because they can be pronounced dogmatically to be no sacraments. It prescribes it because, according to the measure of heresy and the guilt of schism, the administration of sacraments outside the Church becomes deficient, and for that reason the Church cannot regard them as valid *per se*.

Dogmatically, that deficiency is supplied on the reception of individual

heretics and schismatics into Communion by the Church in the exercise of her power as *tamiouchos*. Otherwise the Third and Seventh Councils could not have relaxed the Canons of the Apostles and the Fathers must have maintained its *akribeia*.

And it is thus that the Orthodox Church holds itself to be following the tradition of the Fathers in exercising Economy and accepting those who accede to her Communion in their Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, or in requiring them to be baptized, confirmed and ordained at her discretion.

Speaking generally, her decision in the matter is determined (1) by the degree of the heresy and the hostility to herself of the Communion from which they come to her and (2) by the measure in which the canonical requirements of the sacraments have been preserved in that Communion.

Where there is a close affinity to Orthodox dogmatic teaching in regard to the sacrament in question, where the essentials of the external canonical acts are observed, and where there is a will to draw near to the bosom of Orthodoxy, Economy can be safely exercised and therefore is to be exercised.

But since, in the last extreme, deficiency might come near to rendering a sacrament void and valueless, it would be perilous and indefensible to exercise Economy in cases where the dogmatic teaching of the Church in regard to the particular sacrament in question is wholly rejected and where its external and canonical requisites are completely absent, even though heresy and schism would not be reinforced by the *sunkatabasis*.

In expressing the opinion that as *tamiouchos* the Church *could* accept the priesthood and sacraments of heretics and schismatics among whom they are not accomplished canonically or the Apostolic Succession has been broken (*Ta Hepta Mysteria*, pp. 162-163), Professor Dyovouniotes goes very far, and would appear to advance the opinion that theoretically or dogmatically there is no bar to the acceptance by Economy of the Orders of non-episcopal Churches.

An Œcumenical Council is the only authority that in regard to the sacraments can prescribe a relaxation of *akribeia* which would be obligatory upon the whole Orthodox Church. But of the nature of the case, the synodical authority of an autocephalous Church is competent to prescribe obligatory regulations in its jurisdiction for the exercise or non-exercise of such Economies in regard to the sacraments as are warranted by established precedents or by the decree of the Seventh Œcumenical Council quoted above.

An exercise of Economy in regard to them which was not so warranted—even by a Patriarch—would be regarded as temerarious and approaching *anomia*.

In regard to non-Orthodox Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, the history of the exercise of Economy in the Orthodox Church is as follows:

After the Great Schism the general rule was to receive schismatics in their Baptism and Orders by chrismation. The attempted Latinization of the East during the period of the Crusades having led to frequent reassertions of *akribeia*, the topical Synod of Constantinople in 1261 prescribed that converts should be chrismated and not rebaptised. That prescription, which was repeated by a similar Synod in 1481 and was interpreted as covering Holy Orders, remained uniformly in force throughout the whole Orthodox Church in regard to converts from the

Latin, Monophysite and Nestorian Churches until 1629, but was not held to apply to converts from Protestantism.

In 1629, on account of Uniate aggression, the Russian Patriarch in Synod forbade the exercise of the Economy within his jurisdiction, but in 1669 the same authority ordered it to be exercised again.

In 1718, with the assent of the Œcumenical Patriarch, the Russian Patriarch in Synod ordered all Trinitarian Baptism to be accepted by Economy.

In 1756, however, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem issued a decree forbidding the continuance of the Economy in regard to all Western converts and ordering their rebaptism.

That decree has not been revoked. So that strictly the position is that, while the acceptance by Economy of all Trinitarian Baptism is prescribed by authority in Russia, such a relaxation of *akribeia* is forbidden in the four Patriarchates. In fact, however, the four Patriarchs' decree is very generally regarded as lapsed.

VIII. THE PERMISSIBILITY OF ECONOMIC INTERCOMMUNION

In the previous section I have dealt only with the treatment of converts received by Economy in their Baptism, Confirmation and Orders by the Orthodox Church, but have not touched upon what is known as *Economic Intercommunion*—viz., (1) the resort of members of the Orthodox Church to sacraments administered outside her Communion, and (2) the admission of those not of her Communion to her sacramental administrations.

The treatment of this matter must also be governed (1) by the dogmatic fact that all sacraments outside the Church—sc., the Orthodox Church—are deficient, and are not to be regarded as valid *per se*, and (2) by the canonical fact that the Apostolic Canons order their reiteration. As *tamiouchos*, however, the Church is free to reject them or to accept them in the exercise of Economy, and if she accepts them, *ipso facto* she supplies their deficiency and pronounces them valid *per se*.

Plainly, the above two classes of Economic Intercommunion must be examined separately and neither must in any way be confused with that of the reception of converts in their Baptism and Orders.

(a) *The Resort of the Orthodox to non-Orthodox Sacraments.*

The case for Economy in this matter may be set out thus:

Dogmatically, the Orthodox Church must regard all sacraments administered outside herself as deficient, and cannot recognize them as valid *per se*.

Accordingly, it might be reasoned that Economies could not rightly be exercised whereby (1) Orthodox parents brought their children to receive a Baptism and Confirmation which were deficient and not valid *per se*, and (2) to say nothing of Marriage Blessing and Unction, the members of the Orthodox Church communicated in the Lord's Body and Blood, and received Absolution, through sacraments which were deficient and not valid *per se*.

So far as I am aware, the dogmatic permissibility of this Economy has not been investigated by any Orthodox writer, and it would seem probable that theoretically as *tamiouchos* the Orthodox Church could

exercise the Economy authorizing her members to resort to sacramental ministrations, which, being outside her, must be regarded as deficient and not valid *per se*.

It is at least a sustainable position, however, that—since she is *tamiouchos*—if she exercised that Economy, *ipso facto* she would supply the deficiency of the sacramental ministration to which she authorized her members to resort—i.e., not generally nor for anyone except for her own members, but for them alone and for them only *pro hac vice*.

In that case, her authorization for their reception would carry with it a pronouncement that the sacraments as received by her members were valid *per se*. Moreover, in fact, their reception would not constitute a *communio in sacris* with the Church through whose ministers they were received, but by Economy would be within the *communio in sacris* of the Orthodox Church itself.

(b) *The Admission of the Members of another Church to Orthodox Sacramental Administrations.*

This Economy clearly presents far greater difficulty than the former, under which, though the Baptism and the other sacraments ministered to the Orthodox and their children may be deficient, their deficiency either is supplied or can be supplied.

Dogmatically, neither Baptism nor any other sacrament administered by the Orthodox Church can be deficient.

That by Economy the Orthodox Church can act vicariously for another Church and minister a sacrament which is in deficiency and which she does not pronounce valid *per se* is out of the question.

Accordingly, in ministering Baptism to a child who is not to belong to her *communio in sacris*, she would be ministering it without deficiency but on the condition that by *akribeia* she must thereafter regard it as not valid *per se*. And further, in ministering the Eucharist and other sacraments to those not of her *communio in sacris*, she would pronounce that dogmatically they are capable of receiving her sacramental ministrations. That is to say, she would admit them to her *communio in sacris* for, but only for, the particular occasion.

None the less, if, as is at least very widely held nowadays, no dogmatic obstacle forbids, these Economies are theoretically possible, and given the necessary conditions, *philanthropia* would require their exercise.

There is something like a consensus of opinion among the Fathers for the reception of converts in their Baptism and Orders, and instances of the exercise of that Economy are abundant in their practice. Moreover, the Seventh Œcumenical Council expressly relaxed the *akribeia* of the Apostolic Canon in regard to heretic and schismatic Baptism.

No such tradition exists for Economical Intercommunion.

It is, therefore, held widely among the Orthodox that both because of the principle of Œcumenical unity of action and because the Economies involved relate to the sacraments in general and the Eucharist in particular, practical, if not theoretical, considerations dictate the necessity of an Œcumenical authorization of either form of Economic Intercommunion by the consensus of all the Orthodox autocephalous Churches before it is authorized by a single Church as permissible.

On the other hand, in the Report of the Œcumenical Patriarchate's Commission on Anglican Ordinations drawn up by Professor Komnenos

in 1922 (see *Christian East*, 1922, pp. 107-121) it is contended that of the nature of the case a particular Orthodox Church has discretion to authorize both forms of Economic Intercommunion.

So far as I am aware historically there are no precedents for the authorization of the Orthodox to resort to alien sacraments or for the Orthodox ministration of Baptism and Confirmation to those not of the Orthodox Communion.

But in regard to Orthodox ministration of the Eucharist to those outside the Orthodox Communion, Professor Komnenos held the widespread disapproval of the holding to *akribeia* in the case of Latin captives among the Turks, recorded by Demetrios Chomatenos in 1203, to cover that Economy.

Though authorization of Economic Intercommunion would appear, therefore, to be a permissible exercise of its power as *tamiochos* by the Orthodox Church, the conditions for its exercise would appear to require—

- (i.) That the Church with which it was authorized approximated very closely in its dogmatic teaching, and particularly in its dogmatic teaching as to the sacraments, to that of the Orthodox Church.
- (ii.) That real urgency obtained, such as inability to receive the sacraments ministered under it, or some great profit for individual souls or the common good.
- (iii.) That the general relations to the Orthodox Church of the Church with which it was authorized were such that even if it was not approaching union with it, no confusion could be created which would injure Orthodoxy.

I have not been able to verify the statements, but as far back as thirty years ago I was informed by the Œcumenical Patriarch Joachim III that the admission by the Orthodox of individual Nestorians and of Armenian Monophysites in isolation to Holy Communion had been occasional for centuries and remained occasional.

Since the Great War, with the cognizance or by the direction of their ecclesiastical superiors, the Orthodox authorities in Corcyra, Khartum and elsewhere have admitted large bodies of Armenian refugees which otherwise would have been in spiritual destitution to Orthodox ministrations, including Holy Communion, and the same Economy has been recently extended to a large colony of Nestorians, 5,000 strong, by the Patriarchate of Antioch.

Before the Great War, in the U.S.A., where the Field Officer for the Foreign Born of the Anglican Episcopal Church states that there are now 1½ million Orthodox immigrants, who may be considered as in permanent isolation from Orthodox sacramental ministrations, in Canada, South Africa, and other overseas British Dominions, the resort of the Orthodox to the Anglican clergy for the Marriage Blessing, for the Baptism of their children, for Absolution and for Holy Communion, with or without the authorization of the Bishops representing their particular national autocephalous Churches in those lands, had become frequent.

In the period of the Great War and subsequently, that resort has been greatly increased and authorization of it by the various local Orthodox authorities has frequently been explicit.

That increased authorization has been due in part to the fact that in 1922, after twenty years' investigation, the Œcumenical Patriarchate declared Anglican Orders capable of acceptance by Economy.

Although the Church of Jerusalem and Cyprus at once concurred in that declaration, the other Orthodox autokephalous Churches postponed their decision until the matter could be examined by the corporate action of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches.

None of them, however, has protested against the declaration of the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

No large dispersions of Anglicans existing in Orthodox countries, need for the resort of Anglicans to Orthodox sacramental ministrations is necessarily rare.

I know of no case in which Anglicans have asked for the Baptism of their children by Orthodox clergy.

On the other hand, during and since the War many Anglicans in isolation and necessity have been admitted to Communion by the instruction of Orthodox diocesan Bishops.

During and since the War there have been cases of Anglicans who were in no necessity being invited to receive the Eucharist by Orthodox Bishops. Thus Canon Garland received Communion in 1920 on the personal invitation of the Patriarch of Antioch and although an Anglican chaplain was due in Belgrade on the succeeding Sunday, though without the consent of his Synod the Serb Patriarch himself administered the Eucharist to six Anglicans on Christmas Day, 1927.

Further, with the consent of his Synod the Patriarch of Roumania periodically administers Holy Communion to Queen Marie of Roumania, although she is an Anglican.

Although theoretically permissible, the admission to Communion of members of another Church, unless they are in real isolation or emergency, is generally viewed with anxiety throughout the Orthodox Church.

At the instance of the Patriarch of Roumania, the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 formulated the questions which Orthodox writers had indicated as necessary for the final removal of all doubts as to the capability of Anglican Orders and the Anglican Eucharist being accepted by Economy by the Orthodox Church with a view to submitting the answers to the Pro-Synod in which it is expected that representatives of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches will meet on June 19, 1932.

That Delegation was not plenipotentiary but included synodically appointed representatives of all the Orthodox Churches, and was presided over by the Patriarch of Alexandria.

Having been satisfied with the answers given, the Delegation proceeded to discuss the question of Economic Intercommunion between the two Churches, and as a temporary provision pending a decision by the forthcoming Pro-Synod authorized the resort of those Orthodox who are in lasting isolation to Anglican sacramental ministrations.

It made no pronouncements, however, in regard to the admission of Anglicans to Orthodox sacramental ministrations.

IX. CONCLUSION

The above sections were written to elucidate the principle of Economy, and its exercise, in the Orthodox Church.

If what has been written in them holds good, the relaxations now before our Convocations are not theoretically impossible according to the Orthodox principle of Economy, but that permissibility depends upon practical and canonical considerations.

JOHN A. DOUGLAS.

REVIEW

STUDIES IN EARLY MYSTICISM IN THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST.

Being an account of the rise and development of early Christian Mysticism in the Near and Middle East up to the seventh century, and of the subsequent development of Mysticism in Islam known as Sūfism, together with some account of the relationship between Christian Mysticism and the earliest form of Islamic Mysticism. By Margaret Smith, M.A., Ph.D. Sheldon Press. 12s. 6d.

Readers who had the good fortune some three years ago to come across the biography of Rabi'a, the famous woman Sūfi ascetic and saint, do not need to be told that another book by Dr. Margaret Smith is sure to be interesting and scholarly. Dr. Smith's articles on Al-Ghazzali and other mystics have also increased her reputation. The volume before us shows, however, a notable advance. It is of wider scope, and written with delicate and sympathetic understanding of the subject in hand.

Rabi'a, saint as she was, seems in many ways an unlovely figure. She was heroic, for she was determined to know nothing but God. Yet she turned her eyes too persistently away from the beauties of this earth, and from the sight of her fellow-creatures, to be a lovable or attractive character.

Some of her sayings are nevertheless striking in the extreme. When we see her going with symbolic water and torch to quench the flames of Hell and to set Paradise alight, in order that men, freed from fear of punishment or hope of reward, might love God for Himself alone, we feel that we are in the presence of a soul austere great.

Perhaps it is not wonderful that the study of the life of Rabi'a—probably undertaken because a kind professor suggested it to Miss Smith as a good subject for a thesis, when suitable subjects are so hard to find!—should have led the student on to a wider field of research, the exploration into Mysticism itself.

Some readers will turn more eagerly to the chapter on Mysticism in general; others to the chapters on the particular aspects shown by mystics among early Christians and Sufis. Both sections are equally good.

Let no one be misled by the brevity of Dr. Smith's chapter headed "The Meaning and Nature of Mysticism" into thinking that the treatment of the subject is superficial. All the essentials are there. Many a long and wordy volume on Mysticism succeeds in saying less than Dr. Smith has said in a few pages.

"Mysticism," we read, "represents something much wider

than its derivation: it represents a spiritual tendency which is universal, for we find it in all religions worthy of the name, and in all true faiths, and it is often the most vital element in such faiths. It represents, too, a craving of the human soul which is eternal, for it has appeared at all periods of the world's history. . . .

"Mysticism, then, permeated through and through with this consciousness of the Divine, represents an attitude of the mind in which all other relationships are as nothing compared with the relationship of the soul to God. . . . In the view of the mystic, God contains yet transcends everything; He appears as the One in Whom all is lost, and also the One in Whom all is found."

Mysticism, Dr. Smith insists, aims at a knowledge of Ultimate Reality. God, however, is no abstract Being, but a personal object of love. Mystics long to know Him better that they may love Him more. Mysticism transcends ordinary religion, for Religion normally draws a clear distinction between the Divine and the human, emphasizing the difference between the two, while Mysticism claims that the gulf can be bridged and God and the human soul can taste union.

There are certain postulates in the mystic's creed. The first is that the soul possesses a *spiritual sense*, by which Reality is directly apprehended.

The second is that the soul, since it is able to know God, does so by virtue of something divine within itself. The "divine spark" has always been recognized by mystics of all creeds and ages, though it has been called by many names. Forgetfulness cannot lose this treasure, sin cannot destroy it; on this element of the divine in man is our hope of eternity based.

Again, Mysticism holds that none can attain to a direct knowledge of God except by purification of self. The "natural man" has no comprehension of divine things. Only spirit can know spirit.

And, lastly, "the guide and inspiration of the Soul in its ascent to God is Love."

Following these postulates, Dr. Smith gives a short description of the Mystic Way, and then goes on to say:

"In the following chapters we shall endeavour to show how Mysticism . . . developed and established itself in the Near and Middle East, and how among Christians and Muslims alike it was accepted, on the one hand, as a way of life to be practised as a means to an end, and on the other, as a religious philosophy which satisfied the soul's innate craving to understand its relationship to God, and justified its adoption of the Way which should lead it onward and upward till the Goal should be attained, and

the soul, long parted from its Source, once more find its home in the One Reality—God.”

In the chapter on “Early Christian Asceticism” we are on fairly familiar ground. We have heard before of the hermits of the deserts, of the early system of monks living in lonely cells, of the gradual grouping of huts into the “laura,” and later into the “coenobium.” Ascetic practices were often extreme, and the motive which led to them was more often fear than love. We feel melancholy rather than edified when we read of monks inhabiting cells in which they could not stand upright or sleep lying down, of vigils, fasts, and weeping, prolonged to the utmost limit of human endurance. The nun whose window gave on to the river and who mortified the flesh by never looking out, is matched by the nuns who were found lying in their cell so loaded with chains that they were unable to rise. The “grazers” who ate only grass do not seem to modern eyes much better than Nebuchadnezzar; to be a stylite is only a mad way of making oneself conspicuous, even if the stylite in question aspired to be conspicuous for sanctity.

The coming of monasticism tended somewhat to mitigate the pious eccentricities of the lonely hermit. St. Basil, for instance, whose life has been made known to us in an admirable book by Dr. Lowther Clarke, was the founder of the Greek type of monasticism which has survived to the present day. As far West as Grotta Ferrata, near Rome, there are monks who still follow his rule. Dr. Smith is extremely interesting when she goes on to tell us of the part played by women in early monastic life. Double monasteries were, of course, not unknown, the men working in the field for the women and the nuns making garments for the monks, while the abbot exercised some kind of supervision over the convent rule. Dr. Smith gives some astonishing figures of the numbers of women in certain early nunneries. A dozen convents near the Nile following the Pachomian rule, each might have no less than four hundred sisters. A convent founded by the Coptic abbot Shenoudi had eighteen hundred. Courtesans and dancers, who pursued the hermits into the desert, became converted and embraced the religious life. Some women were so eager in their vocation that they disguised themselves as men, and lived all their lives as monks, the secret of their sex remaining inviolate till their death.

In the time of Mohammed, monasticism was widespread in the Near and Middle East, while hermits and holy men were among the celebrities of their time. It will come as a surprise to most people, however, to read in the chapter “Christianity and Islām at the Beginning of the Islamic Era” how much Mohammedanism was influenced in its early days by Christianity.

"The contact between Muslims and Christians in the first centuries after the conquest was of necessity close," writes Dr. Smith, "and we find it operating in various spheres of life, political, social, professional, cultural, and religious." Christians seemed to have practised their religion without much interference, and Mohammedan men to have often taken Christian wives. Dr. Smith lays great stress on the influence that Christian mothers must have had in forming the beliefs of those brought up in the new creed.

Mohammedans seem to have copied many of the festivals, observances and ways of life of the Christians. Christian asceticism, Christian religious vocations, even many words in the Christian mystical vocabulary, passed with some modification into Islām.

What Dr. Smith has to say on the relations between the two religions is perhaps the most valuable and the most original portion of her book.

She gives us also some short biographies of early Sūfī mystics. Our friend Rabi'a reappears, as also the famous Dhū al-Nūn, Bāyazīd Bistāmī, and several others.

In conclusion Dr. Smith sets out the ideals of early Sūfī and Christian Mysticism, explaining how strikingly alike they are.

"In their ideas regarding the nature of the soul and its relation to the Divine, we find that the early Sūfīs take a view which is to be found also among the Christian mystics." "The Christian mystics and the Sūfīs are at one in their teaching as to the means of escape and the Way of ascent."

Yet we are to remember that "while one type of mysticism may bear so close a resemblance to another, in its doctrines and terminology, that we may say the two must be closely related and the later in point of time must surely be derived from the earlier, yet mysticism in itself can be a purely spontaneous growth, arising in response to the craving in the human soul for a direct and personal experience of the Divine."

One word more. Christian and Sūfī Mysticism may in the early stages have shown much similarity, but there has since been a wide divergence. Will Dr. Smith write us another book, tracing the development of Pantheistic Mysticism in Islām, and of Christocentric Mysticism within the Western Church? Are these two types, or are they not, now too far apart to understand each other?

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

NOTICES

SOMETHING BEYOND: A Life Story. By A. F. Webling. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

It has been acutely observed that no man's portrait can justly be taken while he is in mid-ocean. And the theological speculation of our generation is in mid-ocean. Human language, as Matthew Arnold said long ago, consists of no more than words flung out at an object, and while the objective facts of the Christian religion (whatever these may be) must for ever remain unalterable, the expression and apprehension of these facts must necessarily vary from generation to generation. The principal task of theological writers of our day is to readjust the expression of divine truth employed by earlier writers to the new world of thought in which men now live. Refined intelligences are not prepared to accept on faith a religion set out in terms of a cosmogony which they recognize as demonstrably false.

At long last the Reformation, better the Revolution, of the sixteenth century was not, as with Luther, a moral revolt, or with Calvin, a theological revolt; it was an intellectual revolt. When final judgment is passed it will be seen that Copernicus and Galileo were greater figures than Luther or Calvin; already the systems of Luther and Calvin are moribund, while Copernicus and his followers stand upon a rock. Like M. Jourdain, the reformers were talking prose without knowing it. And the work that was begun in the sixteenth century, with the adumbration of a new solar system, was continued in the nineteenth century by the geologists and physicists, who gave a new picture of the earth and its origin. The Darwinian hypothesis destroyed at one blow the fundamental assumptions of intransigent Protestantism and intransigent Catholicism. On the one hand, the attempt to overthrow the authority of the infallible Church by the infallible Book was laughed out of court; on the other, it became impossible for Catholicism to found an infallible teaching upon Scriptures no longer infallible.

Yet alongside the intellectual weakening of Catholicism, as a religious system it has during the past century regained an ever-increasing hold upon mankind, so much so that the profession of Catholicism is upon the lips of an ever-growing number of Christians, whatever their religious communion, with a corresponding reluctance to use the obsolescent appellation of Protestant. Meanwhile neither Rome, nor Constantinople, nor Canterbury, nor Geneva has been able to effect a reconciliation between faith and knowledge. Rome, moving like some vast fleet according to the speed of the slowest ship, seems least ready to make concessions to knowledge, while in the other Western communions individuals, in contempt of authority, are often far too eager to make concessions to knowledge which constitute a peril to faith. Thus we have a position in which no individual believer, whatever his ecclesiastical allegiance, in his inner consciousness professes the language of the official Church. Theology is still in mid-ocean.

The nature of the problem is brought before us by Mr. Webling in his courageous autobiography entitled *Something Beyond*. He spent the formative years of his early life in and out of many differing English varieties of Protestantism both Nonconformist and Anglican. Taking Holy Orders, he passed in turn under the influence of moderate Anglicanism and Anglo-Catholicism (both in its tolerant and intolerant phases).

Aroused by a chance conversation, he began the study of biblical criticism, and being preferred to a benefice in the country at this time, he gave up his leisure hours to the hitherto closed book of modernism. These excursions undermined his faith; he sank into scientific materialism, and ultimately lost all belief in the love of God. Searching round for a demonstrable basis of certainty for his shaken faith, he found it, or thought he found it, in the achievements of psychical research, in *Something Beyond*.

A wanderer among the Protestant denominations like Justin Martyr among the philosophers, he has set out his most intimate thoughts with a candour worthy of an Augustine, and a literary grace not unworthy of Newman. An artist in words, he has drawn exquisitely sympathetic portraits of contemporary English religious life. But his work is literature only. It is quite destitute of theological value. Indeed, the author is singularly ill-qualified to deal with theology, or even with religion. "Being essentially a sceptic," all his life he has been at the mercy of his environment. He consorted with the Protestants because his mother was a devout Protestant, and became an Anglo-Catholic because his friend Hallam was an Anglo-Catholic. Left to himself, he became a modernist when he read modernism, and found his rock of certainty in psychical research when his attention was drawn in that direction.

Moreover, he began the study of theology too late in life for him to be able to correlate its fundamental affirmations with other elements in human experience. As he himself confesses, with his innate candour of mind, "my own theological outlook was merely a department of my mental activity." He approaches theology as we would a cross-word puzzle; there is a problem to be solved, and interesting to solve, but the solution will leave the world just as it was before.

Now theology is to human life what the multiplication table is to the Bank of England. The idea that its axioms both protect and inspire human happiness makes no appeal to Mr. Webling. And this circumstance is curiously instanced in his own person. All his life long he seems to have stood outside the phenomena which concerned him. His sceptical outlook has blinded him to the vision of God. "I have never," he tells us, "had the vivid consciousness, enjoyed by some, that the unseen powers have been sufficiently interested in my welfare to intervene directly in my small affairs." Even when he took orders, drifting into the priesthood in the same fashion as he would enter another denomination, he did so with no conscious emotion, "an utter devotion to God, a burning love of the souls of men, a gospel which I was compelled to proclaim . . . none of these compelling motives was mine."

Faith, which in others leads to an intense inward conviction, was to him opinion. Instead of setting himself to live the life of faith, he sought rather to attain objective certainty. He viewed the life of faith from outside rather than from within. And, curiously enough, the objective reality he subsequently supposed he had attained in psychical phenomena was only a delusion. The one thing that could convict him was that he should have had a personal psychic experience. But he never did—"I had no conscious psychic experience of any kind whatever during this period. That, of course, to one who is favoured with it, is the most conclusive of all evidences." And so he reveals himself as incredulous of St. Paul and credulous of F. W. M. Myers, and leaves the problem where he found it. The solution he offers would make faith infinitely more

difficult for the majority of mankind, and would darken the lives of many; and, moreover, could he establish his thesis, he could only do so by the overthrow of the very nature of faith itself. What Mr. Webling looks for is not faith but sight.

Yet if the author offers a dreary prospect, he covers much of the right ground. He pictures the religious difficulties of our own day, but, all said and done, he gives a picture taken in mid-ocean. He himself is still drifting towards Something Beyond. We can only be humbly thankful that for many religion remains, even in difficult days, as contact with Something Near.

J. L. BEAUMONT JAMES.

NORTH ITALIAN SERVICES OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY: RECUEIL D'ORDINES DU XI^e SIECLE. Édité par Dom C. Lambot, O.S.B. Henry Bradshaw Society. Vol. lxxvii.

The manuscript of this collection of Ordines is in the handwriting of a single person. Of its *provenance* before it entered the Ambrosian Library at Milan in 1830 nothing is known. The ceremonies are those in use at a greater Church which has attached to it a Church [baptistery?] of St. Mary and a numerous body of clergy. The rites are performed "per officium sacerdotalis et levitici ordinis." There is no explicit mention of an *episcopus*, although some of the ceremonies described cannot have been performed by any other minister than a bishop. The most interesting of the Ordines is the *Ordo Scrutiniarum* (pp. 7-31), which provides for a number of assemblages of catechumens during Lent in preparation for Baptism on Easter Eve. On closer examination it will be found that some of these meetings are for enrolment, prayer, or benediction, and that the word *scrutinium* was used by the writer as a synonym for *signaculum*, and in this, more particular, sense the number of scrutinies is reduced to three—viz., the assemblies on the third and fourth Saturdays in Lent and the Friday before Palm Sunday when exorcisms were administered. The candidates, although "parvuli," and "held in arms" or "in hands," are still called "catechumens" or "competentes." Paradox as it may appear to us, the radical alteration in the significance of the scrutinies, brought about by the substitution of infant for adult baptism, led at Rome to a development of the rites and the increase of their number from three till they corresponded with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. In North Italy, albeit there was a change in the significance of the rites, the number of the scrutinies remained three, and this circumstance affords a clue to the problem of determining the location of the Church to which these Ordines belonged. In St. Ambrose's day (*Epist.* xx. 4) the Tradition of the Creed took place at Milan on the Sunday before Easter: after the eighth century it took place at Milan, Aquileia, Monza, and Como on the Saturday before Palm Sunday, known for that reason as *Sabbato in Symbolo*. In this Ordo it takes place on that Saturday, and is preceded by a rite in which the exorcisms are administered to those who by reason of distant homes, etc., have been prevented from being present on the three occasions of the scrutinies. A non-Italian feature in the praxis of this unidentifiable Church is that the *Effeta* (an imitation of the action of Christ in healing the deaf mute, St. Mark vii. 31-36) is performed, as in the Mozarabic liturgy, by an application of saliva to the mouth and ears of the candidate. In this rite the ceremony of the *Effeta* takes place

at the third scrutiny on the Friday before Palm Sunday and at the special combined scrutiny for the benefit of the later arrivals. It is thus definitely connected with the Tradition of the Creed. At Milan at the time of St. Ambrose it took place on Easter Eve, and was accompanied by the words "Ephphatha, which is, Be opened," but the ceremony, despite the authority of St. Ambrose's *De mysteriis*, disappeared from the Milanese usage represented by Beroldus and the *Manuale Ambrosianum*. Dom Lambot appears to hold that the *De Sacramentis* can be cited as affording evidence of the Ambrosian praxis, but this is a more than questionable assumption. The *De Sacramentis* would lead us to believe that the words "in odorem suavitatis" had been added to "Ephphatha, which is, Be opened," and that perhaps holy oil had come into use. In *De Sacramentis* the nostrils, not the mouth (as in this Ordo), are touched "that thou mayest receive a sweet savour of Christ unto God."

This collection of Ordines commences with a fragmentary and defaced Ordo, which is an attempt to combine the rites of the three Lenten scrutinies so that they would be available for a single occasion outside the Lenten period for the preparation of candidates for Baptism, or for a private Baptism. In this combined rite, the writer directs the nostrils to be touched with saliva, and substitutes for "per virtutem Dei Christi" the words of the Roman usage, "in odorem suavitatis." In this initial Ordo the writer gives the prayers in full, and in the *Ordo Scrutiniorum* he contents himself with giving only the opening words. This seems to point to our clerk as being a copyist rather than a compiler. His interest appears to be to preserve the system of the scrutinies and the special place of the *Effeta*; but when he comes to the baptismal ceremonies he goes beyond the local tradition and gathers from the Gelasian sacramentaries and the *Ordo romanus antiquus*. In the Ordo for Extreme Unction there is evidence of the custom of communion in both kinds. The sick man is communicated "de Sacrificio sancto." The words of administration, in keeping with other North Italian books, are "Corpus domini nostri Iesu Christi sanguine suo tinctum conservet animam tuam in vitam æternam. Amen"; and in the following prayer the presbyter says: "Domine sancte . . . accipienti fratri (sorori) nostro (ae) sacrosanctam hanc eucharistiam corporis . . . sanguinis domini." Confession and absolution follow *after* the unction.

WALTER K. FIRMINER.

THE NATURE OF BELIEF. By M. C. D'Arcy. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

It should be said forthwith that this is a book of outstanding merit and one of the most important contributions of recent years to a philosophical Christian apologetic. "It is a significant sign of the intellectual situation today that only those intellectual movements make any impression on the educated world which carry with them the universal claim to explain the whole of life"—so Heine writes, and his witness is abundantly true regarding contemporary trends in Science as well as in Theology. Father D'Arcy's valuable volume exemplifies this tendency simply because he has never, like some who have yielded the pass to sensationalism, been away from perception of truth as "the whole" and of systematic or organic unity as the test of philosophical competence. In this he is ultra-modern because he occupies a standpoint which dominates *de jure* all aspects and fashions of thought. The question he

asks about Christianity's claim is: "Is there a final and satisfying interpretation of experience as a whole?" And it is in terms of unity and continuity that he relates the preamble of faith with faith's own ultimate and inclusive content.

This inclusive unification, with recognition of degrees of value as the condition of intelligibility, is the key to his affirmation of an initial recognition of God through the witness of universal reason. From a primary generalized whole to an inclusive and coherent whole the mind moves, carrying with it the objective values on its way. In no other way could the implications of both natural science and religion be rationally integrated. For this essential rightness of point of view no praise is too high except it be that which is due on account of the consistency wherewith he has organized the elements in a concrete whole. Nor does it really detract from this appreciation to recognize that the distinctively Christian features in this unification are developed more successfully than those characteristically Roman.

Not the least of the merits of this book is its effective criticism of the founding of spiritual confidence on religious experience alone. In this connection the author's handling of the relation between value and fact is clear and significant, and this is also true regarding his treatment of the internal consistency of the content of a reasonable faith. He also notes the integration of personality by means of an inclusive view of reality, a conscious and final ideal. It might be wished that there were in this book more adequate recognition of the historical implications of religion in its bearings upon the finality of Christianity. His firm appreciation of the intelligence might also have led on to a critique of experience and have led to contact with the precise marks and content of experienced inward illumination (as treated, *e.g.*, by Dom Cuthbert Butler in *Western Mysticism*). An objective content without a precise subjective effect is equivalent to zero. But at least nothing in this volume obscures this logical implication, and certainly the author discloses the genius of a religion in which the Word, the wisdom and knowledge and gift of God, is foundational both for religion and for theology.

F. W. BUTLER.

RACE SEGREGATION IN AFRICA: AN APPEAL. By Walter Aidan Cotton, B.A. Sheldon Press. 2s. 6d.

We welcome Father Cotton's book both for its freshness of vision and for the clear exposition of the principles involved in race segregation in Africa. It is an appeal to all South Africans to lay aside race prejudice and follow the path dictated by justice and Christianity.

The average South African response to the situation is to repress the native still further, and such Acts as the Colour Bar of 1926 are justified by the plea of self-preservation. Few white men will countenance either inter-marriage, economic equality between the races, or "real national territorial segregation." In fact, movements are on foot to extend the present system further north as far as Kenya. Father Cotton outlines the policy of General Smuts, enunciated in his Rhodes Lectures of 1930, and condemns it on the ground that further European colonization would inevitably involve further exploitation of the natives. And even now the South Rhodesian Government is going back on its original constitution by alienating the better half of the colony to white occupation.

Father Cotton appeals to the Christian conscience of the world to

prevent this policy being adopted, and he contends that the European ownership of land should be limited to a large part of the Union of South Africa. There the definitely European national ideals could be fostered and so produce the national unity essential to the well-being of a community. Into this European area no natives should be allowed to immigrate. Those already there should, in an increasing degree, be given equal rights with the Europeans. Outside this area the land should belong to the natives, though some "European aristocracy" would be needed to assist the natives in forming a system of ownership most suitable to their needs.

At the present time South Africa is developing a caste system built on colour, vitiating the economic structure of the country, and pauperizing many whites and natives. No legislation repressing the natives can prevent some whites approximating to the natives, when the dreaded miscegenation will eventuate. Intermarriage may be the key to national unity—not that Father Cotton advocates this, except that he sees it as "the only alternative" to national segregation "congruous with the laws of nature" and the sanctions of our religion.

The book should be read by all interested in mission work; for it shows clearly how vast a responsibility the Church has. It will quicken interest, and encourage serious study in Europe of this most urgent problem.

W. V. RANFORD, S.S.M.

ZEIT UND ORT DER PAULINISCHEN GEFANGENSCHAFTSBRIEFE. By J. Schmid. Herder. Freiburg im Breisgau.

This admirably lucid and complete book answers recent monographs on the Captivity Epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians and Philemon), notably Prof. G. S. Duncan's, which date them from St. Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea or from a supposed imprisonment at Ephesus. It might be summed up as "back to Lightfoot," except that Philippians must be the last of the Captivity Epistles.

Dr. Schmid's main arguments against an Ephesian origin are these. Luke was with Paul when the letters were written. He wrote the Acts, or at least the We-sections. His silence in Acts xix. 20 and xx. 17 ff. is inexplicable, if there was an imprisonment other than a short one with no effect on Paul's plans. The sending of Timothy in xix. 22 exactly fits in with 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10. On Duncan's hypothesis the sending of Timothy in Phil. ii. 19 is identical with that of Acts xix. 22. There is no room for a captivity after this; indeed 2 Cor. i. 23 excludes it—Paul must have given the real reason why he could not come. Therefore Phil. must have been before 1 Cor., i.e. before the sending of Timothy and Erastus. It is agreed to be later than the other three, so that Eph.-Col.-Phm. are put impossibly early.

Again, it is antecedently improbable that practically all the Epistles date from the stay at Ephesus. For one thing, we know that the "collection" was dominant on the Apostle's mind at the time, but it is not mentioned in the Captivity Epistles. The difficulties in the way of the Rome-hypothesis are fairly acknowledged but met satisfactorily.

The Cæsarea-hypothesis is then examined. Paul's expectation of death in Phil. is hardly thinkable at Cæsarea, in view of his appeal to Cæsar. "Cæsar's household," a branch of the Civil Service, no doubt existed at Cæsarea, but it is improbable that in so small a city there was a clearly defined group of converts from the ranks of the officials anxious

to send greetings to far-away Philippi. The case in respect of the other three Epistles is not so clear, but the "fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God" of Col. iv. 11 are more intelligible in the *libera custodia* of Rome than in the imprisonment described in Acts xxiv.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

DIGGING UP BIBLICAL HISTORY. Recent Archæology in Palestine and its bearing on the Old Testament Historical Narratives. By J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. Vol. II. The Croall Lectures for 1928-29 amplified. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Biblical students will eagerly welcome the appearance of Volume II. of Mr. J. Garrow Duncan's lectures in which is gathered much valuable information gleaned from many fields of excavation, including the author's own.

The chapter on "Religion and Cult Objects" is of especial interest. The pig appears to have been used in sacrifice by the cave-dwellers. Mr. Duncan thinks (p. 39) that the Semitic aversion to the use of the pig as food may be due to its sacrosanct character among the original inhabitants, so also does Dr. S. A. Cook in his *Schweich Lectures*, 1925, p. 79 (and see Burney, *Judges*, p. xviii). Mr. Duncan is inclined to identify the mysterious Mekal, whose venerable form is depicted on the stole found in the southern of the two temples of Thutmose III., with Resheph, the god of Phœnician inscriptions (see G. A. Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 55-57, 75-76). But there can scarcely be much resemblance between the aged Mekal and the Apollo-like Resheph (*resheph*=flame, fire bolt—e.g., Hab. iii. 5). Dr. S. A. Cook's comment in his *Schweich Lectures*, p. 130, is worthy of note. "He more naturally resembles the great god Setekh, though this does not exclude the possibility that the god, the Baal of Beth-shan, as we may call him, combined the attributes of Resheph and Setekh: for in this period the great gods were not clearly divided from one another."

In the most useful but all too brief chapter on Inscriptions, in which information concerning inscriptions recently brought to light is gathered from sources not easily accessible to the average Bible student, attention is called (p. 143) to a Hittite stamp on a jar handle, the three characters of which read, according to Professor Sayce, "The sun-god, King of the mountain land" (see Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, 1927, pp. 216, 217). This is interesting as showing the Hittite characters still in use, and as illustrating Genesis xvii. 1, where El Shaddai is evidently the "god of the mountain" of Jerusalem (S. A. Cook, *Schweich Lectures*, p. 141 and Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, p. 216).

The split infinitives on pp. 71 and 99 should be removed in a second edition. Genesis xiv. on p. 143 should read Genesis xvii.

The volume is packed with illuminating comments on words and verses—e.g., p. 7, the "vermillion" of Jeremiah xxii. 14; p. 8, the "pillars" of Judges xvi. 26, the "cisterns that can hold no water" of Jeremiah ii. 13; p. 227, the "deceitful weight" of Micah ii. 11.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

MATTHÄUS UND LUKAS. By Josef Schmid. Herder. Freiburg im Breisgau. 16 M. (Biblische Studien, xxiii. 2-4).

"This investigation is the first submitted to the forum of New Testament scholars from a Catholic pen which claims to be a complete discussion," says Dr. Schmid, an exceptionally able Privatdozent at the

University of Munich. The claim is well founded, for he has read and quotes all the relevant literature, including English books which German Protestants are apt to ignore; some, indeed, would be omitted from a corresponding English survey as unimportant. Perhaps nowhere else can so satisfactory a discussion be found of the relation of the two Gospels to each other. The conclusion is along conventional lines, but none the worse for that. The author may be wrong in holding that every possible hypothesis has been advanced in a century of study, but he cannot be blamed for resolutely eschewing originality.

The agreements of Matthew-Luke in their treatment of Mark are, he claims, readily explained by their independently following the same literary methods, except in some thirty to forty cases, which are best attributed to textual assimilation. The phenomena of the common non-Markan matter of the two Gospels are explained by the theory that they are independent and used a common written source, the order of which is best represented in Luke. This common-sense conclusion is supported by an exhaustive commentary on the separate passages. The investigation is conducted on rigidly scientific lines and authority is not invoked. Dr. Schmid himself holds that the author of the non-Markan source was the Apostle Matthew. In this way he keeps to the Roman Catholic tradition that Matthew is in a sense the earliest Gospel. But, unlikely as the theory seems to many English scholars, so competent a writer is entitled to a view which is far saner than most of the discarded hypotheses recorded in these pages.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

EVERY MAN'S BIBLE: AN ANTHOLOGY ARRANGED WITH AN INTRODUCTION.

By W. R. Inge, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 7s. 6d.

This may be an age of anthologies. Many persons, even of the educated classes, have neither the leisure nor the inclination to peruse original works, especially if they are bulky and difficult to comprehend.

Much, however, depends on the purpose for which the passages of any work are selected. Some years ago Dr. J. G. Frazer compiled an anthology of Biblical passages chosen chiefly for their æsthetic and literary value. The Dean of St. Paul's, on the other hand, wished to help and encourage those who still desire to read the Bible for reasons of devotion and edification. But the Introduction shows clearly that he aims at attracting readers who approach the Bible from a modern and fairly critical standpoint.

The arrangement of the book is clear and interesting. The first two parts on God and Christ will deserve the closest attention, but Parts III. and IV. on the Christian Graces and the Christian experience should prove morally helpful and religiously illuminating.

We could wish that the volume had ended on the high note of the hope of everlasting life, but, anyhow, we trust that it will arouse a new and living interest in the Bible.

L. PATTERSON.

DAS WIEDERAUFLEBEN DES MÖNCHTUMS IM GEGENWÄRTIGEN PROTESTANTISMUS. By F. Parpert. Ernst Reinhardt. München. Sewn 4.80 M.; cloth 6.50 M.

This is the second of Dr. F. Parpert's studies of Monasticism which have been reviewed in *THEOLOGY*. In the first study he deals with Monasticism and the Evangelical Church: here he discusses the revival of Monasticism in contemporary Protestantism.

In his opinion, the Evangelical Church needs Monasticism as a complement and is not in the end conceivable without it. He dismisses the objection that its revival is a relapse into Catholicism. The history of the idea of Monasticism and its realization since the Reformation shows that it survived or was revived in some form in the Protestant Churches or communities. Scholars like Ritschl and Tröltzsch see its transformation into the Protestant sects, while Harnack, and still more Heiler, have been convinced of the desirability or necessity of its revival.

Dr. Parpert's references to religious communities in the Church of England deal with facts familiar to most of us, but few Anglicans know of the foundation of Evangelical Tertiary brotherhoods in Germany, 1921, or of the order of Les Veilleurs by W. Monod. All these movements witness to a desire for a deeper spiritual life and ascetic self-discipline.

L. PATTERSON.

A STUDY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF MALEBRANCHE. By R. W. Church, D.Phil. (Oxon). Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

The chief concern of this essay has been to examine the philosophical system of Malebranche. The theological doctrines, researches into the nature of light and colour, and the controversy with Leibnitz, have been placed on one side, to the gain of concentration upon a clearly defined theme, and the most important element in the work of the great Oratorian. The result is a most interesting and valuable contribution in criticism and exposition. The writer discusses, with an admirable balance of historical reference and running comment, the theories of perception, of judgment, and finally of knowledge advanced by Malebranche, and dwells upon his view of the relation between faith and reason. He brings out decisively the dependence of these views upon the three main doctrines of Malebranche's system: occasionalism, the vision of God, the vision in God. Detailed study of these conceptions involves their consideration with reference to La Forge, Cordemoy, and Arnauld, and the author retains our interest throughout without departure from his motive and aim.

Malebranche is confronted with the situation created by the Cartesian dualism, and his theory of occasionalism is designed to ease the strain of the notion of God as "sole cause." This theory cannot be regarded as completely successful, for it issues in a twofold contradiction: if God is determined by His creatures His omnipotence is contradicted; if they so determine Him they are not themselves absolutely impotent. The issue thus presented is left as an heritage for later enquiry, and was perhaps insoluble on the premises which Malebranche was bound to accept.

The varying fortunes of the long-drawn-out controversy with Arnauld are carefully followed in this volume. The difficulties inherent in a theory of knowledge as intuition are shown to be very great, for when knowledge is so defined "it is difficult to see how the existence of inference and error is to be accounted for."

The prominence of intuition in Malebranche's philosophical outlook need not hamper recognition of the philosophical importance of his doctrine of the Vision in God especially: his inadequate view of the intelligence was a mere consequence of his entanglement in the impossible Cartesian complication awaiting the solvent of Kant and the rise today of an organic philosophy.

F. W. BUTLER.